DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 458 342 UD 034 562

AUTHOR	Dalaker, Joseph
TITLE	Poverty in the United States: 2000. Consumer Income. Current Population Reports.
INSTITUTION	Bureau of the Census (DOC), Washington, DC. Economics and Statistics Administration.
REPORT NO	P60-214
PUB DATE	2001-09-00
NOTE	36p.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/p60-214.pdf.
PUB TYPE	Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Age Differences; Blacks; Family Characteristics; *Family Income; Geographic Location; Hispanic Americans; Low Income Groups; *Poverty; Racial Differences; Socioeconomic Status; Tables (Data); Working Poor
IDENTIFIERS	Current Population Survey

ABSTRACT

This report illustrates how poverty rates vary by selected characteristics (age, race, and Hispanic origin, nativity, family composition, work experience, and geography), using data from the Census Bureau's March 2001 Current Population Survey. The 2000 poverty rate dropped half a percentage point from 1999, to 11.3 percent. This decrease was not concentrated in any one U.S. region. Blacks and female-householder families set record low poverty rates in 2000. The poverty rate for people under age 18 years dropped to 16.2 percent. Poverty rates fell for blacks and Hispanics between 1999-00. While blacks remained disproportionately poor, the difference in poverty rates between blacks and white non-Hispanics narrowed since the most recent poverty rate peak. Compared with the most recent poverty rate peak in 1993, more people in 2000 lived in families with at least one worker, and the poverty rate for people in these families fell since 1993. Four appendixes present data on poverty status by family relationship, race, and Hispanic origin 1959-2000; poverty status of people by age, race, and Hispanic origin, 1959-2000; poverty status of families by type of family, 1959-2000; and people and families in poverty by selected characteristics: 1993 and 2000. (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 458 342

Poverty in the United States: 2000

Issued September 2001

P60-214



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

U.S. Department of Commerce
Economics and Statistics Administration
U.S. CENSUS BUREAU

USCENSUSBUREAU

Helping You Make Informed Decisions

UD034562

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was prepared under the direction of **Charles T. Nelson**, Assistant Division Chief for Income, Poverty, and Health Statistics. **Bernadette D. Proctor, Erika Steinmetz,** and **Amanda Kohler** provided statistical assistance.

David Nguyen, Demographic Surveys Division, processed the March 2001 Current Population Survey file. **Caroline Carbaugh**, Chief of the Survey Processing Branch, **Stacy Lyons, Mary Thrift Bush,** and **Kirk Davis** programmed the detailed tables and produced the publication tables.

Tim J. Marshall, under the supervision of **Greg Weyland**, Demographic Surveys Division, prepared specifications for the computer-assisted interviewing instrument used to conduct the March income supplement. **Andrew M. Stevenson**, Technologies Management Office, programmed the instrument.

Additional people within the Census Bureau also made significant contributions to the preparation of this report. **Kathleen S. Short, John Iceland, Shailesh Bhandari, Richard Levy,** and **Larry Long** reviewed the contents.

Sampling review was conducted by **Alfred G. Meier** and **Jana Shepherd** of Demographic Statistical Methods Division.

U.S. Census Bureau field representatives and telephone interviewers collected the data. Without their dedication, the preparation of this report or any other report from the Current Population Survey would be impossible.

Barbara M. Abbott, Jan Sweeney, Gloria Davis, and **Barbara H. Blount** of the Administrative and Customer Services Division, **Walter C. Odom**, Chief, provided publications and printing management, graphics design and composition, and editorial review for print and electronic media. General direction and production management were provided by **Michael G. Garland,** Assistant Chief, and **Gary J. Lauffer,** Chief, Publications Services Branch.

Poverty in the United States: 2000

Issued September 2001
P60-214

Current Population Reports
Consumer Income

U.S. Department of Commerce
Donald L. Evans,
Secretary

Economics
and Statistics
Administration
Kathleen B. Cooper,
Under Secretary for
Economic Affairs

U.S. CENSUS BUREAU
William G. Barron, Jr.,
Acting Director

SUGGESTED CITATION

Dalaker, Joseph
U.S. Census Bureau,
Current Population Reports,
Series P60-214,
Poverty in the United States: 2000,
U.S. Government Printing Office,
Washington, DC, 2001

Economics and Statistics Administration

Kathleen B. Cooper,
Under Secretary
for Economic Affairs

U.S. CENSUS BUREAU

William G. Barron, Jr.,
Acting Director

William G. Barron, Jr.,
Deputy Director

John H. Thompson,
Principal Associate Director
for Programs

Nancy M. Gordon,
Associate Director
for Demographic Programs

Daniel H. Weinberg,
Chief, Housing and Household
Economic Statistics Division

For sale by Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

CONTENTS

TEXT

Poverty in the United States: 2000 . . . 1
Introduction . . . 1
Highlights . . . 1
Poverty in the United States . . . 1
How the Census Bureau Measures Poverty . . . 5
Age . . . 6
Race and Hispanic Origin . . . 6
Nativity . . . 6
Families and Unrelated Individuals . . . 7
Work Experience . . . 8
Region . . . 8
Residence . . . 9
State Poverty Data . . . 10
Interpreting State Poverty Data . . . 10
"Depth of Poverty" Measures . . . 10
Example: "Depth of Poverty" Measures . . . 10
Ratio of Income to Poverty Level . . . 10
Income Deficit . . . 10
Experimental Poverty Measures . . . 14
Standardized Poverty Rates . . . 15
Notes, Additional Data, and Users' Comments . . . 16
CPS Sample Expansion . . . 16
CPS Data Collection . . . 16
Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates . . . 16
Additional Data and Contacts . . . 17
Comments . . . 17

TEXT TABLES

A. People and Families in Poverty by Selected Characteristics: 1999 and 2000 . . . 2
B. Number of Poor and Poverty Rate by Race and Hispanic Origin: 1998, 1999, and 2000 . . . 7
C. Percent Composition of People in Families by Number of Full-Time and Part-Time Workers: 1993 and 2000 . . . 9
D. Percent of People in Poverty by State: 1998, 1999, and 2000 . . . 11
E. Ratio of Family Income to Poverty Threshold for People by Selected Characteristics: 2000 . . . 13
F. Income Deficit or Surplus of Families and Unrelated Individuals by Poverty Status: 2000 . . . 13
G. Selected Experimental Poverty Measures: 1990 to 2000 . . . 15
H. Experimental Poverty Measures by Selected Characteristics: 2000 . . . 16

FIGURES

1. Number of Poor and Poverty Rate: 1959 to 2000 . . . 3
2. Poverty Rates by Age: 1959 to 2000 . . . 4
3. Poverty Rates by Race and Hispanic Origin: 1959 to 2000 . . . 4
4. Poverty Rates of People in Families by Presence of Workers: 1993 to 2000 . . . 8
5. Percent of People in Families by Number of Workers: 1993 to 2000 . . . 9
6. Poverty Rates of People in Families by Family Type and Presence of Workers: 2000 . . . 9
7. States With Significant Changes in 2-Year Average Poverty Rates: 1998-99 and 1999-2000 . . . 12

APPENDIX. Time Series Poverty Estimates

A-1. Poverty Status of People by Family Relationship, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1959 to 2000 . . . 18
A-2. Poverty Status of People by Age, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1959 to 2000 . . . 23
A-3. Poverty Status of Families by Type of Family: 1959 to 2000 . . . 27
A-4. People and Families in Poverty by Selected Characteristics: 1993 and 2000 . . . 28

Poverty in the United States: 2000

INTRODUCTION

Poverty data offer an important way to evaluate the nation's economic well-being. Because poor people in the United States are too diverse to be characterized along any one dimension, this report illustrates how poverty rates vary by selected characteristics—age, race and Hispanic origin,[1] nativity, family composition, work experience, and geography. These data reveal how many people were poor and how the poverty population has changed. A description of how the Census Bureau measures poverty may be found on page 5.

The estimates in this report are based on the March 2001 Current Population Survey, conducted by the Census Bureau. Respondents provide answers to the best of their ability, but as with all surveys, the estimates may differ from the actual values. For further information about the source and accuracy of the estimates, go to *www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/poverty00/pov00src.pdf*.

Confidence intervals for poverty rate estimates are provided in Table A. The uncertainty in the estimates should be taken into consideration when using them.

HIGHLIGHTS

- The poverty rate in 2000 dropped to 11.3 percent, down half a percentage point from 1999. This rate was not statistically different from the record low of 11.1 percent set in 1973. About 31.1 million people were poor in 2000, 1.1 million fewer than in 1999.
- The decrease in poverty between 1999 and 2000 was not concentrated in any one region of the United States, although the poverty rate did fall significantly for those living in metropolitan areas but outside of central cities (7.8 percent in 2000, down from 8.3 percent in 1999).
- Several groups set record-low poverty rates in 2000, while others tied their record-lows:
  - Blacks (22.1 percent) and female-householder families (24.7 percent) had their lowest measured poverty rates in 2000.
  - People 65 years old and over (10.2 percent), Asians and Pacific Islanders (10.8 percent), Hispanics (21.2 percent), White non-Hispanics (7.5 percent), married-couple families (4.7 percent), and people living in the South (12.5 percent) had poverty rates in 2000 that were not statistically different from their measured lows.
- The poverty rate for people under 18 years old dropped to 16.2 percent in 2000 (down from 16.9 percent in 1999)—their lowest poverty rate since 1979.
- The poverty rate declined more for 18- to 24-year-olds than for any other age group.
- Poverty rates fell for Blacks (from 23.6 percent to 22.1 percent) and Hispanics (from 22.8 percent to 21.2 percent) between 1999 and 2000.[2]
- While Blacks remained disproportionately poor, the difference in poverty rates between Blacks and White non-Hispanics narrowed since the most recent poverty rate peak. In 1993, the Black poverty rate was 23.2 percentage points higher than that for White non-Hispanics; by 2000 this difference had fallen to 14.6 percentage points.
- Compared with the most recent poverty rate peak in 1993, a greater percentage of people in 2000 lived in families with at least one worker, and the poverty rate for people in these families fell since 1993; however, poor family members in 2000 were more likely to be living with at least one worker.

POVERTY IN THE UNITED STATES

The poverty rate in 2000 dropped to 11.3 percent, down half a percentage point from 1999 (11.8 percent) and was not statistically distinguishable from the record-low 11.1 percent set in 1973.[3] About 1.1 million fewer people were poor in 2000 than in 1999.

Many groups with poverty rate declines between 1999 and 2000 historically have had high poverty rates. Most of the net decline in the overall poverty rate occurred among children and people 18 to 24 years old. Other groups with

[1] Hispanics may be of any race. About 14.2 percent of Whites, 3.0 percent of Blacks, 1.9 percent of Asians and Pacific Islanders, and 11.0 percent of American Indians and Alaska Natives were of Hispanic origin.

[2] In both 1999 and 2000, the poverty rates for Blacks and Hispanics were not statistically different from each other.

[3] The 2000 poverty rate (11.3 percent) was also not significantly different from the poverty rate in 1979 (11.7 percent), but was lower than the rate for every year since, thus making the 2000 poverty rate the lowest in 21 years.

Table A.
People and Families in Poverty by Selected Characteristics: 1999 and 2000

(Numbers in thousands. For an explanation of confidence intervals (C.I.), see "Standard errors and their use" at www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/poverty00/pov00src.pdf)

Characteristic	2000 below poverty				1999 below poverty				Change[1] 1999 to 2000			
	Number	90-pct. C.I. (±)	Percent	90-pct. C.I. (±)	Number	90-pct. C.I. (±)	Percent	90-pct. C.I. (±)	Number	90-pct. C.I. (±)	Percent	90-pct. C.I. (±)
PEOPLE												
Total	31,139	880	11.3	0.3	32,258	893	11.8	0.3	*–1,119	931	*–0.5	0.3
Family Status												
In families	22,088	755	9.6	0.3	23,396	775	10.2	0.3	*–1,308	803	*–0.6	0.4
Householder	6,226	227	8.6	0.3	6,676	237	9.3	0.3	*–450	265	*–0.7	0.4
Related children under 18	11,086	451	15.7	0.7	11,510	457	16.3	0.7	–424	477	–0.7	0.7
Related children under 6	3,931	283	16.9	1.3	4,170	290	18.0	1.3	–240	299	–1.2	1.4
In unrelated subfamilies	520	59	39.4	5.2	558	61	39.1	4.9	–37	63	0.3	5.3
Reference person	198	36	37.5	7.9	216	38	37.9	7.6	–18	39	–0.4	8.1
Children under 18	314	82	41.8	12.3	336	86	41.0	11.7	–22	87	0.8	12.6
Unrelated individual	8,530	276	18.9	0.6	8,305	271	19.1	0.7	226	288	–0.2	0.7
Male	3,458	161	16.0	0.8	3,398	160	16.3	0.8	60	169	–0.3	0.8
Female	5,073	202	21.6	0.9	4,907	197	21.7	0.9	166	209	–0.1	1.0
Race[2] and Hispanic Origin												
White	21,291	742	9.4	0.3	21,922	752	9.8	0.3	–631	852	–0.3	0.4
Non-Hispanic	14,572	622	7.5	0.3	14,875	628	7.7	0.3	–303	714	–0.2	0.4
Black	7,901	416	22.1	1.2	8,360	423	23.6	1.2	*–459	441	*–1.5	1.2
Asian and Pacific Islander	1,226	178	10.8	1.6	1,163	173	10.7	1.6	63	184	0.1	1.6
Hispanic[3]	7,155	398	21.2	1.2	7,439	401	22.8	1.2	–283	334	*–1.5	1.0
Age												
Under 18 years	11,633	461	16.2	0.6	12,109	467	16.9	0.7	–476	487	*–0.7	0.7
18 to 64 years	16,146	648	9.4	0.4	16,982	663	10.0	0.4	*–836	688	*–0.6	0.4
18 to 24 years	3,893	192	14.4	0.7	4,603	207	17.3	0.8	*–710	211	*–2.9	0.8
25 to 34 years	3,892	199	10.4	0.5	3,968	201	10.5	0.5	–75	209	–0.1	0.6
35 to 44 years	3,678	192	8.2	0.4	3,733	194	8.3	0.4	–55	204	–0.1	0.5
45 to 54 years	2,441	158	6.4	0.4	2,466	158	6.7	0.4	–25	166	–0.3	0.4
55 to 59 years	1,175	110	8.8	0.8	1,179	110	9.2	0.9	–4	117	–0.4	0.9
60 to 64 years	1,066	105	10.2	1.0	1,033	104	9.8	1.0	33	110	0.4	1.0
65 years and over	3,360	179	10.2	0.5	3,167	174	9.7	0.5	*192	186	0.5	0.6
Nativity												
Native	26,442	816	10.7	0.3	27,507	831	11.2	0.3	* –1,065	864	*–0.5	0.4
Foreign born	4,697	411	15.7	1.4	4,751	413	16.8	1.5	–54	433	–1.1	1.5
Naturalized citizen	1,107	201	9.7	1.8	968	188	9.1	1.8	139	204	0.6	1.9
Not a citizen	3,590	360	19.4	1.9	3,783	368	21.3	2.1	–193	382	–1.9	2.1
Region												
Northeast	5,433	357	10.3	0.7	5,678	364	10.9	0.7	–244	378	–0.6	0.7
Midwest	5,971	411	9.5	0.7	6,210	419	9.8	0.7	–239	436	–0.3	0.7
South	12,205	595	12.5	0.6	12,538	602	13.1	0.6	–333	628	–0.5	0.7
West	7,530	474	11.9	0.8	7,833	482	12.6	0.8	–303	502	–0.6	0.8
Residence												
Inside metropolitan areas	24,296	788	10.8	0.4	24,816	796	11.2	0.4	–520	831	*–0.4	0.4
Inside central cities	12,967	589	16.1	0.7	13,123	592	16.4	0.7	–156	620	–0.2	0.8
Outside central cities	11,329	553	7.8	0.4	11,693	561	8.3	0.4	–364	584	*–0.4	0.4
Outside metropolitan areas	6,843	530	13.4	1.1	7,442	553	14.3	1.1	*–599	568	–0.9	1.1
FAMILIES												
Total	6,226	227	8.6	0.3	6,676	237	9.3	0.3	*–450	265	*–0.7	0.4
White	4,153	179	6.9	0.3	4,377	184	7.3	0.3	*–224	215	*–0.4	0.4
Non-Hispanic	2,820	145	5.3	0.3	2,942	148	5.5	0.3	–121	173	–0.2	0.3
Black	1,686	109	19.1	1.3	1,898	117	21.9	1.4	*–212	128	*–2.8	1.5
Asian and Pacific Islander	235	39	8.8	1.5	258	41	10.3	1.7	–23	46	–1.5	1.8
Hispanic[3]	1,431	100	18.5	1.4	1,525	104	20.2	1.4	–94	97	*–1.7	1.3
Type of Family												
Married-couple	2,638	140	4.7	0.3	2,673	140	4.8	0.3	–35	160	–0.1	0.3
White	2,163	125	4.4	0.3	2,161	125	4.4	0.3	2	148	–	0.3
Non-Hispanic	1,447	100	3.3	0.2	1,457	100	3.3	0.2	–10	120	–	0.3
Black	260	41	6.1	1.0	294	44	7.1	1.1	–35	49	–1.1	1.2
Asian and Pacific Islander	169	33	7.7	1.5	162	33	8.1	1.6	7	38	–0.4	1.8
Hispanic[3]	742	71	14.1	1.4	728	71	14.2	1.4	14	67	–	1.3
Female householder, no husband present	3,099	151	24.7	1.3	3,531	163	27.8	1.4	*–432	181	*–3.1	1.6
White	1,656	109	20.0	1.4	1,883	115	22.5	1.5	*–227	133	*–2.5	1.7
Non-Hispanic	1,127	89	16.9	1.4	1,255	94	18.6	1.5	*–127	107	*–1.8	1.7
Black	1,303	95	34.6	2.8	1,499	102	39.3	3.0	*–196	114	*–4.7	3.3
Asian and Pacific Islander	60	20	19.9	7.1	76	23	23.1	7.4	–17	25	–3.1	8.3
Hispanic[3]	597	64	34.2	4.0	686	69	38.8	4.3	*–89	63	*–4.6	4.0

– Represents zero. * Statistically significant at the 90-percent confidence level.

[1]As a result of rounding, some differences may appear to be slightly higher or lower than the differences of the reported rates.
[2]Data for American Indians and Alaska Natives are not shown separately.
[3]Hispanics may be of any race.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, March 2000 and 2001.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

significant poverty rate decreases were Blacks, Hispanics, and families with a female householder and no husband present. These groups have historically had high poverty rates (see Appendix Tables A-1 to A-3). The decrease in poverty between 1999 and 2000 did not appear concentrated in any one region of the United States, although the suburbs of metropolitan areas did show a poverty rate decrease.[4] Table A presents the number of poor and poverty rates in 1999 and 2000 for many demographic groups, and shows which groups had significant changes.

The drop in the poverty rate between 1999 and 2000 belongs to a larger story of economic recovery since the last recession.[5] Figure 1 shows the number of poor and poverty rate over time, beginning with 1959 (the first year for which poverty data are available), and labels which years had recessions. Poverty rates have tended to peak just after a recession.[6] After the most recent recession, the poverty rate peaked in 1993 (15.1 percent), although that was not an all-time high.[7] Figures 2 and 3 show historical poverty rates by age and by race and Hispanic origin. Between 1993 and 2000, each group depicted had statistically significant declines in their poverty rates. Notably, those groups with higher poverty rates had their rates fall further than those with lower poverty rates. In particular, the poverty rate differentials between Blacks and White non-Hispanics, and between Hispanics and White non-Hispanics both fell (see "Race and Hispanic Origin" on page 6). Complete comparisons of 2000 estimates with 1993 are presented in Appendix Table A-4.

The year 2000 also brought historically low poverty rates for some groups. Blacks and female-householder families set record lows, while those aged 65 and over, White non-Hispanics, Asians and Pacific Islanders, Hispanics, married-couple families, and people living in the South had poverty rates not statistically different from their historic lows.

[4]In this report "suburb" is defined as within a metropolitan area but outside of a central city.

[5]According to the National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc., the most recent recession began in July 1990 and ended in March 1991.

[6]The poverty rate is a lagging indicator, since it responds after changes in the overall economy have taken place. The lag, in part, comes from the poverty measure's computation—it uses income from the entire calendar year.

[7]The poverty rate in 1993 did not change significantly from 1992.

Figure 1.
Number of Poor and Poverty Rate: 1959 to 2000



Note: The data points represent the midpoints of the respective years. The latest recession began in July 1990 and ended in March 1991.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, March 1960-2001.

Figure 2.
Poverty Rates by Age: 1959 to 2000



Note: The data points represent the midpoints of the respective years. The latest recession began in July 1990 and ended in [illegible] 1991.
Data for people 18 to 64 and 65 and older are not available from 1960 to 1965.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, March 1960-2001.

Figure 3.
Poverty Rates by Race and Hispanic Origin: 1959 to 2000



Note: The data points represent the midpoints of the respective years. The latest recession began in July 1990 and ended in March 1991.
Data for Blacks are not available from 1960 to 1965. Data for the other race and Hispanic origin groups are shown from the first year available.
Hispanics may be of any race.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, March 1960-2001.

How the Census Bureau Measures Poverty

Following the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) Statistical Directive 14, the Census Bureau uses a set of money income thresholds that vary by family size and composition to determine who is poor (see the matrix below).

Poverty Thresholds in 2000 by Size of Family and Number of Related Children Under 18 Years

(Dollars)

Size of family unit	Related children under 18 years								
	None	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	Eight or more
One person (unrelated individual):									
Under 65 years	8,959								
65 years and over	8,259								
Two people:									
Householder under 65 years	11,531	11,869							
Householder 65 years and over	10,409	11,824							
Three people	13,470	13,861	13,874						
Four people	17,761	18,052	17,463	17,524					
Five people	21,419	21,731	21,065	20,550	20,236				
Six people	24,636	24,734	24,224	23,736	23,009	22,579			
Seven people	28,347	28,524	27,914	27,489	26,696	25,772	24,758		
Eight people	31,704	31,984	31,408	30,904	30,188	29,279	28,334	28,093	
Nine people or more	38,138	38,322	37,813	37,385	36,682	35,716	34,841	34,625	33,291

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

If a family's total income is less than that family's threshold, then that family, and every individual in it, is considered poor. The official poverty thresholds do not vary geographically, but they are updated annually for inflation using the Consumer Price Index (CPI-U). The official poverty definition counts money income before taxes and does not include capital gains and noncash benefits (such as public housing, Medicaid, and food stamps).

Example: Suppose Family A consists of five people: two children, their mother, father, and great-aunt. Family A's poverty threshold in 2000 was $21,065. Suppose also that each member had the following incomes in 2000:

Mother	$10,000
Father	5,000
Great-aunt	10,000
First child	0
Second child	0
Total:	$25,000

Since their total family income, $25,000, was greater than their threshold ($21,065), the family would not be considered "poor" according to the official poverty measure.

While the thresholds in some sense represent families' needs, the official poverty measure should be interpreted as a statistical yardstick rather than as a complete description of what people and families need to live. Moreover, while we use the official measure to report poverty data, most aid programs use different dollar amounts as eligibility criteria.

Poverty rates and the number of poor are one important way of examining people's well-being; however, this report also presents other more detailed measures. For further discussion about poverty measurement, see the sections "Depth of Poverty Measures" and "Experimental Poverty Measures."

For a history of the official poverty measure see Fisher, Gordon, "The Development of the Orshansky Thresholds and Their Subsequent History as the Official U.S. Poverty Measure" at *www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/povmeas/papers/orshansky.html.*

Weighted average thresholds: Some data users want a summary of the 48 thresholds to get a general sense of the "poverty line." These average thresholds provide that summary but they are not used to compute poverty data.

One person	$ 8,794
Two people	11,239
Three people	13,738
Four people	17,603
Five people	20,819
Six people	23,528
Seven people	26,754
Eight people	29,701
Nine people or more	35,060

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Age

For the third consecutive year, people under age 18 experienced a poverty rate decrease, from 16.9 percent in 1999 to 16.2 percent in 2000—the lowest the child poverty rate has been since 1979.

Although children in married-couple families showed no change in poverty (8.2 percent were poor in 2000), the poverty rate fell for children living in families with a female householder and no husband present, from 41.9 percent in 1999 to 39.8 percent in 2000, which was still about five times the rate for their counterparts in married-couple families.[8]

Despite the decrease in child poverty, people under age 18 continued to have a higher poverty rate than other age groups. People age 18 to 64 had a poverty rate of 9.4 percent in 2000, down 0.6 percentage points from their 1999 rate (10.0 percent). People age 65 and over had a poverty rate of 10.2 percent in 2000, statistically unchanged from their historical low reached in 1999, although the number of poor elderly increased slightly from 3.2 million to 3.4 million between the 2 years.[9]

People 18 to 24 years old had nearly a 3 percentage-point drop in their poverty rate—from 17.3 percent in 1999 to 14.4 percent in 2000. This drop was larger than that for any other age group.

Race and Hispanic Origin

Blacks and Hispanics experienced poverty rate decreases between 1999 and 2000. For Blacks, their 2000 poverty rate of 22.1 percent (down from 23.6 percent in 1999) was the lowest measured since 1959, the earliest year for which poverty data are available. About a half-million fewer Blacks were poor in 2000 than in 1999 (7.9 million compared with 8.4 million).

Figure 3 shows poverty rates by race over time. Since 1993, the year the poverty rate peaked after the 1990-91 recession, the Black poverty rate dropped from about one-third (33.1 percent) to less than one-fourth (22.1 percent). Over the same time span, the difference between the Black poverty rate and the White non-Hispanic poverty rate narrowed. The Black poverty rate was 23.2 percentage points higher than that for White non-Hispanics in 1993; by 2000 this difference declined to 14.6 percentage points—still substantially higher even while the Black poverty rate was at its historic low.

The Hispanic poverty rate dropped from 22.8 percent in 1999 to 21.2 percent in 2000—a record low that was not statistically different from the low rates during 1972-74 and 1977-79.[10] The number of poor Hispanics did not change significantly between 1999 and 2000 (7.2 million in 2000). The difference between Hispanic and White non-Hispanic poverty rates fell between 1993 and 2000—from 20.7 percentage points to 13.7 percentage points.

Neither poverty rates nor the number of poor among White non-Hispanics or Asians and Pacific Islanders changed between 1999 and 2000. The White non-Hispanic poverty rate in 2000 equaled its all-time low (7.5 percent), which did not differ from rates registered during the 1973 to 1975 period, and again in 1999. Asians and Pacific Islanders had a poverty rate of 10.8 percent in 2000—also equal to its record low.[11] As in previous years, most of the poor in 2000 were White (68 percent) and 47 percent were White non-Hispanic.

The Current Population Survey, the source of these data, samples about 50,000 households nationwide and is not large enough to produce reliable annual estimates for American Indians and Alaska Natives. However, Table B displays 3-year averages of their poverty rate and number of poor for 1998-2000, along with similar data for other racial and ethnic groups. The 3-year average poverty rate for American Indians and Alaska Natives (25.9 percent) was not significantly different from that for Blacks or Hispanics, but was higher than for the other race groups.

Looking at differences in 2-year averages between 1999-2000 and 1998-99 in Table B, American Indians and Alaska Natives did not have any significant change in their poverty rate over the 3-year period. Blacks and Hispanics had a significant decrease in their poverty rate.

Nativity

The foreign-born population, which includes both naturalized citizens and noncitizens, experienced no significant change in its poverty rate or number of poor between 1999 and 2000 (15.7 percent and 4.7 million in 2000). Among naturalized citizens, 1.1 million were poor in 2000, for a poverty rate of 9.7 percent; both figures were statistically unchanged from 1999. Among noncitizens, 3.6 million or 19.4 percent were poor in 2000, statistically unchanged from 1999.

The native population,[12] however, had significant decreases in both its poverty rate (from 11.2 percent in 1999 to 10.7 percent in 2000) and number of poor (from

[8]Poverty rates for children by family type include only children who are related to the householder, but are not themselves the householder or spouse (they are labeled "related children" in the tables). The overall child poverty rate includes all people under age 18 regardless of their family relationship.

[9]The poverty rate for people 65 years and over in 2000 was not significantly different from the rate for those aged 18 to 64.

[10]Poverty data for Hispanics are available from 1972 onward.

[11]Poverty rates for White non-Hispanics are available from 1973 onward. Poverty data for Asians and Pacific Islanders are available from 1987 onward.

[12]Natives are defined as people born in the United States, Puerto Rico, or an outlying area of the United States, and those born in a foreign country but who had at least one parent who was a U.S. citizen. All others are foreign-born regardless of date of entry into the United States or citizenship status. The Current Population Survey, the source of these data, does not extend to Puerto Rico or to the outlying areas of the United States, and thus those living there are excluded from the official poverty statistics.

Table B. **Number of Poor and Poverty Rate by Race and Hispanic Origin: 1998, 1999, and 2000**

(Number in thousands. For an explanation of confidence intervals (C.I.), see *www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/poverty00/pov00src.pdf*)

Characteristic	3-year average 1998-2000		Average 1999-2000		Average 1998-99		Difference in 2-year moving averages[1]	
	Value	90-percent C.I. (±)	Value	90-percent C.I. (±)	Value	90-percent C.I. (±)	Value	90-percent C.I. (±)
PERCENT								
All races	11.9	0.2	11.5	0.3	12.3	0.3	*–0.7	0.4
White	9.9	0.2	9.6	0.3	10.1	0.3	*–0.6	0.4
Non-Hispanic	7.8	0.2	7.6	0.3	7.9	0.3	–0.3	0.3
Black	23.9	0.9	22.9	1.0	24.8	1.0	*–2.0	1.3
American Indian and Alaska Native	25.9	3.3	27.1	3.8	26.1	3.8	1.0	4.9
Asian and Pacific Islander	11.3	1.2	10.7	1.3	11.6	1.4	–0.9	1.8
Hispanic[2]	23.1	1.0	22.0	1.1	24.2	1.2	*–2.2	1.4
NUMBER								
All races	32,624	656	31,698	755	33,367	772	*–1,669	988
White	22,222	529	21,607	614	22,688	628	*–1,081	807
Non-Hispanic	15,082	442	14,723	514	15,337	524	–614	674
Black	8,451	311	8,131	357	8,726	366	*–595	468
American Indian and Alaska Native	701	103	766	121	692	115	75	152
Asian and Pacific Islander	1,250	130	1,194	149	1,261	153	–67	195
Hispanic[2]	7,555	320	7,297	362	7,754	370	–457	471

*Statistically significant at the 90-percent confidence level.

[1]As a result of rounding, some differences may appear to be slightly higher or lower than the difference of the reported rates.
[2]Hispanics may be of any race.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, March 1999, 2000, and 2001.

27.5 million in 1999 to 26.4 million in 2000). While the 2000 poverty rate for natives (10.7 percent) was lower than the foreign-born poverty rate (15.7 percent), the poverty rate for naturalized citizens (9.7 percent) was not significantly different from the poverty rate for natives. Since noncitizens composed the majority (18.5 million) of the 29.9 million foreign-born individuals, the foreign-born poverty rate was therefore higher (15.7 percent compared with 11.3 percent for all people).

During the recent economic expansion between 1993 and 2000, noncitizens had the most dramatic decrease in their poverty rate (from 28.7 percent in 1993 to 19.4 percent in 2000), followed by natives (14.4 percent in 1993 to 10.7 percent in 2000). Naturalized citizens did not have any significant change in their poverty rate between 1993 and 2000 (10.1 percent in 1993, similar to 9.7 percent in 2000).

Families and Unrelated Individuals

The number of poor families fell by nearly half a million between 1999 and 2000, bringing the family poverty rate down from 9.3 percent in 1999 to 8.6 percent in 2000—a 26-year low. The number of poor families was 6.2 million in 2000, down from 6.7 million in 1999. Between 1999 and 2000, families with a female householder and no husband present attained historically low poverty rates, while married-couple families equaled their historic low set in 1999.

The poverty rate for families with a female householder and no husband present dropped from a previous low of 27.8 percent in 1999 to its new record low of 24.7 percent in 2000. From 1959 (the first year these data are available) to 1998, their poverty rate had never fallen significantly below 30 percent. In 2000, 3.1 million female-householder families were poor, down from 3.5 million in 1999. This record-low poverty rate for female-householder families warrants particular attention because female-householder families have grown as a share of all families—in 1959, they made up 10 percent of all families, but by 2000 their share had grown to 17 percent of all families.

Recent poverty rate declines for female-householder families stand out more dramatically when disaggregated by race and Hispanic origin. From 1967 (the first year of available data) to 1999, Black female-householder families never experienced a poverty rate significantly below 40 percent—until 1989, their rate had not gone significantly below 50 percent—but in 2000 their rate dropped to 34.6 percent. Similarly, Hispanic female-householder families did not have a poverty rate significantly below 50 percent until 1998, but by 2000 their rate had fallen to 34.2 percent.[13] While White non-Hispanic female-householder families historically have fared better (before

[13]The poverty rates in 2000 for Black and Hispanic female-householder families were not significantly different from each other.

1999 their poverty rates were between 20 and 25 percent), their rate also set a record-low of 16.9 percent in 2000. (For family poverty rates by race over time, go to *www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/histpov/hstpov4.html.*)

Work Experience

Because poverty status is computed on the family level, if one family member works, the poverty status of every family member is affected. (See "How the Census Bureau Measures Poverty" on page 5.) Hence, Figure 4 shows poverty rates from 1993 to 2000 for people categorized by whether any family member worked. Figure 5 shows what percentages of people lived in families with at least one worker. As was shown in Figure 1, in the current business cycle, the poverty rate peaked in 1993; 1993 is therefore used for comparison.

The poverty rate fell for people living in families with no workers. However, as more people have gotten jobs, people with no working family members made up a smaller fraction of the population in 2000 than they did in 1993 (9.4 percent compared with 12.2 percent).

The poverty rate also fell for people in families with at least one worker, though not as precipitously. However, this decline deserves attention, because the share of the population with a working family member has grown since 1993.

Despite these poverty rate declines, having a job, even a full-time job, does not guarantee an escape from poverty. In 2000, a greater percentage of the poor had one full-time worker in the family than in 1993 (44.5 percent compared with 36.0 percent—see Table C). Thus, even though people with working family members were less likely to be poor in 2000 compared with 1993, the poor were more likely to have a working family member.

Figure 6 illustrates how widely poverty rates vary when those living with workers and those living without workers are further categorized by family type. The former had lower poverty rates than the latter in all family types. However, for both, those who lived with workers and those who did not, people in female-householder families had a poverty rate at least four-and-a-half times greater than their counterparts in married-couple families. People in female-householder families with no workers had the highest poverty rate—two-thirds were poor.

Region

None of the four regions registered a significant change in poverty rate or number of poor between 1999 and 2000. The poverty rates in 2000 were 10.3 percent for the Northeast, 9.5 percent for the Midwest, 12.5 percent for

Figure 4.
Poverty Rates of People in Families by Presence of Workers: 1993 to 2000



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, March 1994-2001.

Figure 5.
Percent of People in Families by Number of Workers: 1993 to 2000



Note: Because of rounding, some percentages may not appear to sum to 100.0 percent.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, March 1994-2001.

Table C.
Percent Composition of People in Families by Number of Full-Time and Part-Time Workers: 1993 and 2000

Characteristic	All people in families		Poor people in families	
	1993	2000	1993	2000
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
With no full-time workers	18.3	14.7	56.0	46.1
With one full-time worker	40.9	41.1	36.0	44.5
With two or more full-time workers	40.7	44.2	9.0	9.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
With no part-time workers	65.7	68.5	72.4	71.5
With one or more part-time workers	34.3	31.5	27.6	28.5

Note: Because of rounding, some percentages may not appear to sum to 100.0 percent.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, March 1994 and 2001.

Figure 6.
Poverty Rates of People in Families by Family Type and Presence of Workers: 2000



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, March 2001.

the South, and 11.9 percent for the West.[14] The poverty rate for the South remained at its historic low.

Since 1994, the South's poverty rate has not been significantly different from that for the West. Before then, the South had the highest poverty rate among the four regions.

Residence

The poverty rate decreased for "suburbs" (metropolitan areas outside central cities), from 8.3 percent in 1999 to 7.8 percent in 2000. For people living inside central cities, the poverty rate was 16.1 percent in 2000, statistically unchanged from 1999. Taking suburbs and central cities together, the poverty rate for people in metropolitan areas was 10.8 percent in 2000, down from 11.2 percent in 1999.

Among those living outside metropolitan areas, the number of poor dropped to 6.8 million in 2000, down from 7.4 million in 1999. That decline did not translate to a lower poverty rate—13.4 percent were poor in 2000, statistically unchanged from 1999.

[14]The poverty rates for the Northeast and Midwest were not significantly different from each other, but each were significantly lower than the rates for the South and West.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

State Poverty Data

Table D contains poverty rates for the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the United States using 3-year averages covering 1998 to 2000 to improve the statistical reliability of the estimates. (See the text box "Interpreting State Poverty Data" on this page.) These 3-year average poverty rates ranged from 7.3 percent in Maryland to 19.3 percent in New Mexico. Although New Mexico appeared to have the highest poverty rate, its poverty rate was not statistically different from those in Louisiana or the District of Columbia, but was higher than the remaining 48 states. While the poverty rate for Maryland appeared to be the lowest, its rate was not statistically different from those in 16 other states.

To compare change in poverty rates at the state level, the Census Bureau recommends 2-year moving averages (1999-2000 and 1998-99). Based on this approach, Figure 7 shows that ten states plus the District of Columbia had statistically significant decreases in their poverty rates, and none showed an increase. The states were Arizona, California, Florida, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, and Pennsylvania.

"DEPTH OF POVERTY" MEASURES

While categorizing people as "poor" and "nonpoor" is one summary of economic position, in reality economic situations fall under a much broader spectrum. Two "depth of poverty" measures more fully reflect the *distribution* of people's economic well-being. The ratio of income to poverty compares a family's income with its poverty threshold, and expresses that comparison as a fraction. The income deficit tells how many dollars a family's income is below its poverty threshold. These measures illustrate how the composition of the poor population varies by the severity of poverty.

Interpreting State Poverty Data

State level estimates are not as reliable as national level estimates. These state poverty rate estimates are intended to provide a sense of the ranges within which the poverty rates probably exist. Do not compare poverty rate estimates across states because their variability is too high. The 3-year average poverty rate for Maryland, for example, was not significantly different from that of 16 other states.

Why show averages? Why not show the latest year alone?

Averaging poverty rates over several years improves the estimates' reliability. An estimate's reliability is measured by a 90-percent confidence interval: the smaller the confidence interval, the more reliable the estimate. For instance, using year 2000 data alone, Alabama had a confidence interval of ±2.8 percentage points around its poverty rate, but using a 3-year average the confidence interval decreased to ±2.1. For more information on confidence intervals, see the CPS Source and Accuracy Statement at *www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/poverty00/pov00src.pdf*.

Example: "Depth of Poverty" Measures

Suppose Family A has five people—two children and three adults—and has an income of $25,000.

$$\text{Ratio of income to poverty} = \frac{\text{Family A's income}}{\text{Family A's poverty threshold}} \quad \frac{\$25{,}000}{\$21{,}065} = 1.19$$

Since Family A's income-to-poverty ratio was at least as great as one, Family A is not poor. However, since its ratio was also less than 1.25, it would be considered "near poor," and its five members would be tallied in Table E as "Under 1.25." All people in the same family have the same ratio.

Since Family A's income was greater than its threshold, its income surplus—the number of dollars above its poverty threshold—was $3,935 ($25,000-$21,065).

Ratio of Income to Poverty Level

The percentage of people whose family income was less than half their poverty threshold dropped significantly, from 4.6 percent in 1999 to 4.4 percent in 2000, although the number of people below 50 percent of poverty remained statistically unchanged at 12.2 million in 2000. As in 1999, these people made up 39 percent of the poor population.

The "near poor" (those with family incomes at least as great as their threshold but less than 1.25 times their threshold) had no change in their number or in their share of the total population—12.3 million and 4.5 percent in 2000.

While some demographic groups make up similar shares of the population at varying degrees of poverty, others are unevenly distributed. Table E presents the number of people and percent below multiples of their poverty threshold—those below 50 percent of poverty ("Under 0.50"), those in poverty ("Under 1.00") and those below 125 percent of poverty ("Under 1.25"). Among people aged 65 and over, 2.2 percent were below 50 percent of their poverty threshold, compared with 4.4 percent for all people. However, among those below 125 percent of poverty, the elderly rate (16.9 percent) was higher than that for all people (15.8 percent). These differences indicate that people aged 65 and over were more highly concentrated just above the poverty level than they were among the extremely poor.

Income Deficit

The income deficit for families in poverty (the difference in dollars between a family's income and its poverty

Table D.
Percent of People in Poverty by State: 1998, 1999, and 2000

State	3-year average 1998-2000		Average 1999-2000		Average 1998-99		Difference in 2-year moving averages	
	Percent	90-pct. C.I. (±)	Percent	90-pct. C.I. (±)	Percent	90-pct. C.I. (±)	Percent	90-pct. C.I. (±)
United States	11.9	0.2	11.5	0.3	12.3	0.3	*–0.7	0.2
Alabama	14.6	2.1	14.6	2.4	14.8	2.5	–0.2	2.0
Alaska	8.3	1.6	7.8	1.9	8.5	1.9	–0.7	1.6
Arizona	13.6	1.8	12.0	2.1	14.3	2.2	*–2.2	1.8
Arkansas	15.8	2.1	16.4	2.5	14.7	2.4	1.6	2.1
California	14.0	0.8	13.3	0.9	14.6	1.0	*–1.2	0.8
Colorado	8.5	1.6	8.1	1.9	8.7	1.9	–0.6	1.6
Connecticut	7.6	1.8	6.7	2.0	8.3	2.2	–1.6	1.8
Delaware	9.8	2.0	9.5	2.3	10.3	2.3	–0.8	1.9
District of Columbia	17.3	2.6	14.8	2.8	18.6	3.1	*–3.7	2.6
Florida	12.1	1.0	11.5	1.2	12.8	1.2	*–1.2	1.0
Georgia	12.6	1.7	12.1	2.0	13.2	2.1	–1.1	1.7
Hawaii	10.5	2.1	10.3	2.4	10.9	2.4	–0.6	2.0
Idaho	13.3	1.9	13.5	2.2	13.5	2.3	–	1.8
Illinois	10.5	1.1	10.8	1.3	10.0	1.2	0.8	1.1
Indiana	8.2	1.6	7.6	1.9	8.0	1.9	–0.5	1.7
Iowa	7.9	1.7	7.3	1.9	8.3	2.0	–1.0	1.6
Kansas	10.4	1.9	10.8	2.2	10.9	2.2	–	1.8
Kentucky	12.5	2.0	11.9	2.3	12.8	2.3	–0.9	1.9
Louisiana	18.6	2.2	18.3	2.6	19.1	2.6	–0.8	2.2
Maine	9.8	2.0	9.5	2.3	10.5	2.4	–1.0	1.9
Maryland	7.3	1.7	7.4	2.0	7.2	1.9	0.2	1.6
Massachusetts	10.2	1.3	10.9	1.6	10.2	1.6	0.7	1.3
Michigan	10.2	1.1	9.9	1.3	10.3	1.3	–0.4	1.1
Minnesota	7.8	1.6	6.6	1.7	8.8	1.9	*–2.2	1.6
Mississippi	15.5	2.1	14.5	2.4	16.9	2.6	*–2.4	2.0
Missouri	9.7	1.8	9.7	2.1	10.7	2.2	–1.0	1.7
Montana	16.0	2.1	15.8	2.5	16.1	2.5	–0.3	2.1
Nebraska	10.6	1.9	9.8	2.2	11.6	2.3	–1.8	1.8
Nevada	10.0	1.8	9.7	2.0	10.9	2.2	–1.2	1.7
New Hampshire	7.4	1.8	6.3	1.9	8.8	2.2	*–2.5	1.7
New Jersey	8.1	1.1	7.9	1.2	8.2	1.3	–0.3	1.0
New Mexico	19.3	2.3	18.7	2.6	20.5	2.7	–1.8	2.2
New York	14.7	1.0	13.8	1.1	15.4	1.1	*–1.6	0.9
North Carolina	13.2	1.5	12.9	1.7	13.8	1.7	–0.9	1.4
North Dakota	12.7	2.1	11.5	2.3	14.1	2.5	*–2.6	2.0
Ohio	11.1	1.2	11.1	1.3	11.6	1.4	–0.5	1.1
Oklahoma	14.1	2.0	14.0	2.3	13.4	2.3	0.6	2.0
Oregon	12.8	2.1	11.6	2.3	13.8	2.5	*–2.1	2.0
Pennsylvania	9.9	1.0	9.2	1.2	10.3	1.2	*–1.2	1.0
Rhode Island	10.0	2.1	9.2	2.4	10.7	2.5	–1.5	2.0
South Carolina	11.9	2.1	11.0	2.3	12.7	2.4	–1.7	2.0
South Dakota	9.3	1.7	8.6	2.0	9.3	2.0	–0.7	1.8
Tennessee	13.3	2.0	13.3	2.4	12.7	2.3	0.6	2.0
Texas	14.9	1.1	14.9	1.2	15.0	1.3	–0.2	1.0
Utah	8.1	1.5	7.6	1.7	7.3	1.7	0.3	1.5
Vermont	10.1	2.0	10.2	2.4	9.8	2.3	0.4	2.0
Virginia	8.1	1.6	7.8	1.8	8.4	1.9	–0.6	1.5
Washington	9.4	1.8	9.6	2.2	9.2	2.1	0.4	1.8
West Virginia	15.8	2.1	14.8	2.4	16.8	2.5	–2.0	2.0
Wisconsin	8.8	1.7	8.9	2.0	8.7	1.9	0.2	1.7
Wyoming	11.0	1.9	11.2	2.3	11.1	2.2	0.1	1.8

– Represents zero.
* Statistically significant at the 90–percent confidence level.

Note: For an explanation of confidence intervals (C.I.), see "Standard errors and their use" at *www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/poverty00/pov00src.pdf*.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, March 1999, 2000, and 2001.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Figure 7.
States With Significant Changes in 2-Year Average Poverty Rates: 1998-99 and 1999-2000



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, March 1999, 2000, and 2001

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table E.
Ratio of Family Income to Poverty Threshold for People by Selected Characteristics: 2000

(Numbers in thousands. For an explanation of "Ratio of Income to Poverty," see example on page 10)

Characteristic	Total	Under 0.50		Under 1.00		Under 1.25	
		Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total
PEOPLE							
Total	275,917	12,158	4.4	31,139	11.3	43,465	15.8
Age							
Under 18 years	71,932	4,693	6.5	11,633	16.2	15,671	21.8
18 to 24 years	26,962	1,760	6.5	3,893	14.4	5,259	19.5
25 to 34 years	37,440	1,793	4.8	3,892	10.4	5,320	14.2
35 to 44 years	44,780	1,404	3.1	3,678	8.2	5,159	11.5
45 to 54 years	38,040	971	2.6	2,441	6.4	3,433	9.0
55 to 59 years	13,338	456	3.4	1,175	8.8	1,586	11.9
60 to 64 years	10,446	353	3.4	1,066	10.2	1,451	13.9
65 years and over	32,979	727	2.2	3,360	10.2	5,587	16.9
Race[1] and Hispanic Origin							
White	225,993	8,002	3.5	21,291	9.4	30,828	13.6
Non-Hispanic	193,878	5,725	3.0	14,572	7.5	21,306	11.0
Black	35,748	3,363	9.4	7,901	22.1	10,154	28.4
Other races	14,176	793	5.6	1,946	13.7	2,483	17.5
Asian and Pacific Islander	11,357	449	4.0	1,226	10.8	1,590	14.0
Hispanic[2]	33,719	2,460	7.3	7,155	21.2	10,072	29.9
FAMILY STATUS							
In families	229,476	8,197	3.6	22,088	9.6	31,353	13.7
Householder	72,383	2,412	3.3	6,226	8.6	8,889	12.3
Related children under 18	70,769	4,306	6.1	11,086	15.7	15,039	21.3
Related children under 6	23,261	1,730	7.4	3,931	16.9	5,373	23.1
Unrelated individual	45,120	3,651	8.1	8,530	18.9	11,496	25.5
Male	21,629	1,639	7.6	3,458	16.0	4,594	21.2
Female	23,491	2,012	8.6	5,073	21.6	6,902	29.4

[1]Data for American Indians and Alaska Natives are not shown separately.
[2]Hispanics may be of any race.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, March 2001

Table F.
Income Deficit or Surplus of Families and Unrelated Individuals by Poverty Status: 2000

(Numbers in thousands. For an explanation of "Income Deficit," see page 10)

Characteristic	Total	Size of deficit or surplus										Average deficit	Deficit per capita
		Under $500	$500 to $999	$1,000 to $1,999	$2,000 to $2,999	$3,000 to $3,999	$4,000 to $4,999	$5,000 to $5,999	$6,000 to $6,999	$7,000 to $7,999	$8,000 or more		
Deficit for Those Below Poverty													
All families	6,226	261	302	623	561	471	472	481	393	402	2,259	6,820	1,922
Married-couple families	2,638	139	145	289	237	223	222	191	136	139	916	6,612	1,712
Families with female householders, no husband present	3,099	98	137	290	275	229	205	246	230	206	1,183	7,018	2,084
Unrelated individual	8,530	557	779	1,427	1,206	707	493	454	449	454	2,004	4,388	4,388
Male	3,458	186	308	515	481	237	217	173	204	197	939	4,724	4,724
Female	5,073	371	471	912	725	470	276	281	245	257	1,065	4,159	4,159
Surplus for Those Above Poverty													
All families	66,158	386	318	768	808	820	774	829	865	816	59,773	56,427	18,001
Married-couple families	52,968	205	171	404	440	453	477	492	511	539	49,276	62,599	19,490
Families with female householders, no husband present	9,427	146	124	293	317	290	257	280	266	234	7,219	27,778	9,701
Unrelated individual	36,590	540	629	1,549	1,237	1,361	1,166	1,038	1,257	967	26,846	26,622	26,622
Male	18,171	223	172	618	428	539	479	401	594	399	14,318	31,067	31,067
Female	18,419	317	457	931	809	822	687	637	663	569	12,529	22,237	22,237

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, March 2001

threshold) averaged $6,820 in 2000 (see Table F), not significantly different from the 1999 figure of $6,912.[15] The per capita income deficit among people in families was $1,922 in 2000, also not different from the 1999 figure of $1,972.

Between 1999 and 2000, families with a female householder and no husband present experienced decreases in their average income deficit (from $7,309 to $7,018) and their income deficit per capita (from $2,223 to $2,084). Married-couple families in 2000 had a lower average deficit and deficit per capita than female-householder families: $6,612 and $1,712, respectively, in 2000: neither figure was significantly different from its 1999 value. Income deficit per capita is computed by dividing the average deficit by the average number of people per family. Because families with a female householder and no husband present were smaller than married-couple families, the greater per capita deficit for female-householder families reflects their smaller family size as well as their lower income.

Poor unrelated individuals (people who do not live with relatives) had an average income deficit of $4,388 in 2000—$4,159 for women, which was significantly lower than the $4,724 for men. Because there were more female than male unrelated individuals aged 65 and over, and because unrelated individuals aged 65 and over had lower poverty thresholds, the lower average deficit for women reflects differences in age, not just income.

In 2000, 261,000 poor families had incomes less than $500 below their poverty thresholds, while 386,000 had incomes within $500 above their respective poverty thresholds. Therefore, the overall poverty rate would likely change more if the thresholds were slightly higher than if the thresholds were slightly lower.

EXPERIMENTAL POVERTY MEASURES

Using different methods to measure poverty changes one's perception of who is poor. To measure poverty, two important components must be considered:

1. How does one measure a family's (or person's) needs?
2. What resources should one count as income for meeting those needs?

In 1995, a panel from the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) issued a report that recommended new ways to measure income, families' needs, and other aspects related to measuring poverty.[16] Because the official poverty measure does not show how taxes, noncash benefits, and work-related expenses affect people's well-being, the NAS panel observed that the official measure does not show how policy changes in those areas affect the poor. In addition, the panel noted that the official poverty measure does not take into account how the cost of basic goods (such as food and housing) has changed relative to other goods since the early 1960s, when the official poverty measure was developed. Moreover, it does not reflect that costs vary by geography. Nor do the official thresholds, according to the NAS panel, accurately account for increased expenses and economies of scale that occur as family size increases. Hence, the NAS panel suggested a way to construct a new poverty measure that addresses these issues.

The Census Bureau has been conducting research to refine some of the panel's measurement methods and to examine how adapting the NAS panel's recommendations would affect the number of poor and the poverty rate.[17] Four experimental measures are discussed below.

The first measure most closely implements the NAS panel's recommendations for setting poverty thresholds and scaling them by family size, adjusting them for geographic differences in housing costs, counting noncash benefits as income, and subtracting from income some work-related, health, and child care expenses.

The second experimental measure is called DCM (Different Child Care Method).[18] Since the CPS March Supplement, the source of the poverty data, does not ask how much families spend on child care, these expenses must be estimated. But while the NAS measure estimates *whether* a family incurs child care expenses, and if so, how much, the DCM measure assigns fixed amounts of child care expenses to working families with children under age 12, based on the number and age of children in the family. Both of these measures use data from the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) to estimate child care expenses.[19]

Another measure is the DES, which uses a "Different Equivalence Scale" from the NAS measure to adjust for changes in expenses as family size increases. The NAS measure uses a two-parameter equivalence scale. The NAS measure's first parameter adjusts poverty thresholds by family size to reflect that children, on average, consume less than adults; its second parameter reflects that as family size increases, some expenses like clothing increase

[15]All 1999 figures are expressed 2000 dollars.

[16]Citro, Constance F. and Robert T. Michael, *Measuring Poverty: A New Approach*. Washington, DC, National Academy Press, 1995.

[17]Short, Kathleen, Thesia Garner, David Johnson, and Patricia Doyle, *Experimental Poverty Measures: 1990 to 1997*. U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, Consumer Income, P60-205, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, 1999. See also Short, Kathleen, John Iceland, and Thesia I. Garner, "Experimental Poverty Measures: 1998." U.S. Census Bureau Web report, September, 1999, *www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/povmeas/exppov/exppov.html*. A new report, Short, Kathleen "Experimental Poverty Measures: 1999," will be issued in October 2001. See also the Census Bureau's poverty measurement Web site for additional studies: *www.census.gov/hhes/www/povmeas.html*.

[18]This measure was called DCM1 in the report, *Experimental Poverty Measures: 1990 to 1997* (P60-205).

[19]For a more detailed description of these approaches to estimating child care expenses, see Short et al., *Experimental Poverty Measures: 190 to 1997* (P60-205), pp.8 and C-11.

additively, but other expenses like housing do not. The DES measure adds a third parameter, which allows the first child in a single-adult family to represent a greater increase in expenses than the first child in a two-adult family.

The final experimental measure examined here does not adjust thresholds for geographic differences in costs of living; hence, this measure is called NCA (No Geographic Adjustment).

As one would expect, when poverty measures are defined differently, they yield different poverty rates (Table G). Except for the NCA measure, poverty rate declines for the experimental measures were not different from the official measure between 1993 and 2000. However, the NAS and DCM measures did not have a significant decrease between 1999 and 2000, in contrast with the official measure.

More noteworthy, however, when the poverty definition changes, not all population groups are affected uniformly. Table H shows how standardized poverty rates for population groups differ among the experimental measures, and how those rates compare with their official poverty rates. For an explanation of standardized poverty rates, see the "Standardized Poverty Rates" text box on this page.

The experimental measures yielded higher poverty rates for people in married-couple families than did the official measure. In contrast, people in families with a female householder and no husband present had lower poverty rates under the experimental measures than under the official measure.

Table G.
Selected Experimental Poverty Measures: 1990 to 2000

(Poverty rates are standardized to the 1997 poverty rate. For an explanation of standardized poverty rates, see text box)

Year	Official	National Academy of Sciences	Different child care method	Different equivalence scale	No geographic adjustment
1990	13.5	13.7	13.6	13.6	13.8
1991	14.2	14.5	14.3	14.4	14.6
1992	14.8	15.1	15.0	15.1	15.2
1993	15.1	15.8	15.7	15.8	15.8
1994	14.6	14.6	14.5	14.6	14.6
1995	13.8	13.8	13.8	13.8	13.9
1996	13.7	13.6	13.7	13.6	13.5
1997	13.3	13.3	13.3	13.3	13.3
1998	12.7	12.5	12.5	12.4	12.3
1999	11.8	11.7	11.9	11.8	11.7
2000	11.3	11.5	11.7	11.4	11.3

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, March 1991 to 2001, and "Selected Experimental Poverty Measures: 1990 to 1999" available at *www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/povmeas/exppov/suexppov.html*.

Standardized Poverty Rates

What are "standardized" poverty rates?

Ordinarily, each of the four experimental measures would yield a different overall poverty rate, because they each define poverty differently. *Standardizing* the measures means their overall poverty rates were fixed to equal one another in some reference year.

Why standardize to 1997 poverty rates?

The experimental poverty rates for the 2000 totals appear close but not exactly equal to one another. These experimental measures were adjusted so their overall poverty rates for 1997 equal the official poverty rate for 1997. This was done so that the figures here would be comparable with the standardized measures in the report, *Experimental Poverty Measures: 1990 to 1997*. If the measures were standardized to the current official poverty rate each year, then the measures would not be comparable over time.

Why standardize at all?

It is often useful to compare poverty rates for the same population group across different measures. However, since each measure has a different way of counting income and measuring need, the measures ordinarily yield different overall poverty rates and total numbers of people in poverty. Thus, if two measures have different poverty rates for a population group, it is difficult to determine, just by looking at the numbers, to what extent the poverty rates differ because the *overall* poverty rates differ, or because the measures yield different poverty rates for that group *relative* to other groups.

Since standardizing the measures fixes their overall poverty rates equal to one another and to the official rate, we can observe the relative differences in poverty rates among population groups. By observing the relative differences in poverty rates across measures, we learn how each measure changes our perception of who is poor.

Making these relative comparisons easier comes at a price. First, as the standardized experimental poverty rates diverge over time from the official rate, it becomes more difficult to distinguish whether poverty rate differences for a population group are relative differences or whether they come from differences in the overall poverty rate. Second, just as not all people are equally poor—some people have much less income in relation to their threshold than others do—so too the composition of the poor population is not the same for all levels of poverty. When the experimental measures are lowered to yield identical overall poverty rates, some people close to the poverty line for each measure are excluded from the poverty population who otherwise would be included. Since the composition of the poor population varies by the severity of poverty, the standardized experimental measures reveal a slightly different composition of poor people than they would without standardization.

To learn more about standardized poverty measures, see the report, *Experimental Poverty Measures: 1990 to 1997*, especially pp. 16-23.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table H.
Experimental Poverty Measures by Selected Characteristics: 2000

(Poverty rates are standardized to the 1997 official rate. For an explanation of standardized poverty rates, see text box on page 15)

Characteristic	Official	National Academy of Sciences	Different child care method	Different equivalence scale	No geographic adjustment
Total	11.3	11.5	11.7	11.4	11.3
People in families	9.6	10.2	10.5	9.9	10.0
People in married-couple families	5.7	6.9	6.9	6.4	6.7
People in families with a female householder, no husband present	27.9	24.6	26.1	24.7	24.9
Race and Hispanic Origin					
White	9.4	10.0	10.2	10.0	9.9
Black	22.1	19.5	20.2	19.6	19.4
Hispanic[1]	21.2	21.8	22.3	21.4	19.9
Age					
Under 18 years	16.2	14.3	15.1	14.0	14.2
18 to 64 years	9.4	9.7	9.8	9.8	9.5
65 years and over	10.2	14.5	14.1	14.6	14.6
Region					
Northeast	10.3	11.6	11.8	11.7	9.5
Midwest	9.5	9.0	9.3	9.0	9.7
South	12.5	11.6	11.8	11.7	13.0
West	11.9	13.5	13.7	13.4	11.9

[1]Hispanics may be of any race.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, March 2001.

The poverty rates for Whites were slightly higher under the experimental measures than under the official measure, while poverty rates for Blacks were lower. The poverty rate for Hispanics was lower under the NCA measure and higher under the other measures. The Hispanic poverty rate was lowest under the NCA measure partly because Hispanics were highly concentrated in areas with high housing costs, such as California.

Poverty rates by age under the experimental measures also differed from the official measure. The experimental measures showed lower poverty rates among children and higher poverty rates among the elderly.

The geographically adjusted poverty measures (NAS, DCM, DES) yielded higher poverty rates in the Northeast and West, where housing costs are higher; similarly, poverty rates in the Midwest and South were lower when using these measures. The opposite occurred using the NCA measure.

More information on experimental poverty measures can be found on the Census Bureau's Poverty Measurement Research Web site at *www.census.gov/hhes/www/povmeas.html*. The Census Bureau plans to continue to issue reports on experimental poverty measures, in order to help policy makers improve their understanding of how measurement issues affect the perception of who is poor.

NOTES, ADDITIONAL DATA, AND USERS' COMMENTS

CPS Sample Expansion

The number of households interviewed using the March 2001 CPS was expanded from March 2000. Estimates in this report, however, are based on a subsample consistent with the March 2000 CPS. The Census Bureau will release a report this winter discussing the impact of the sample expansion on income estimates. For further information, see *www.bls.census.gov/cps/ads/data_dissem_letterng.htm*.

CPS Data Collection

The information in this report was collected in the 50 states and the District of Columbia and does not include residents of Puerto Rico. The estimates in this report are controlled to national population estimates by age, race, sex, and Hispanic origin, and are based on a sample of about 50,000 households nationwide. The population controls used to prepare the estimates are based on results of the 1990 census carried forward to 2000 (they are not based on Census 2000).

Because the CPS is primarily a household survey, people without conventional housing who are not living in shelters are excluded from these poverty statistics. The CPS also excludes armed forces personnel living on military bases and people living in institutions. For further documentation about the CPS March supplement, see *www.bls.census.gov/cps/ads/adsmain.htm*.

Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates

Model-based state and county poverty estimates for income years 1993, 1995, and 1997 are available on the Internet at *www.census.gov/hhes/www/saipe.html*. The

Census Bureau calculated these model-based estimates by combining results from the CPS, food stamp records, tax records, and the 1990 decennial census. Poverty estimates are also available on that Web site for related children 5 to 17 years old by school district. The model-based state estimates have less uncertainty than those directly estimated from the CPS; the model-based estimates are also the only intercensal source of county and school district poverty estimates from the Census Bureau. State estimates for income year 1998 were released in August 2001. State, county, and school district estimates for 1999 will be released in fall 2002.

Additional Data and Contacts

Detailed tables, historical tables, press releases and briefings, and unpublished data are available electronically on the U.S. Census Bureau's poverty Web site. The Web site may be accessed through the Census Bureau home page at *www.census.gov* or directly at *www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty.html*. CPS microdata are available for downloading through the FERRET system. FERRET may be accessed by clicking on "Access Tools" on the Census Bureau home page or by clicking the FERRET link on the poverty Web site. These CPS microdata have been reviewed to prevent disclosure of individuals' identities.

If you have trouble finding poverty data or have questions about them, you may contact the Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division information staff by e-mail at *hhes-info@census.gov* or by phone at 301-457-3242.

Comments

The Census Bureau welcomes the comments and advice of data and report users. If you have suggestions or comments, please write to:

Charles T. Nelson
Assistant Division Chief of Income, Poverty, and Health Statistics
Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division
U.S. Census Bureau
Washington, DC 20233-8500

or by e-mail to *charles.t.nelson@census.gov*.

Appendix. Time Series Poverty Estimates

Table A-1.
Poverty Status of People by Family Relationship, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1959 to 2000

[Numbers in thousands. People as of March of the following year]

Year and characteristic	All people			People in families						Unrelated individuals		
		Below poverty level		All families			Families with female householder, no husband present				Below poverty level	
					Below poverty level			Below poverty level				
	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent
ALL RACES												
2000	275,917	31,139	11.3	229,476	22,088	9.6	37,428	10,436	27.9	45,120	8,530	18.9
1999	273,493	32,258	11.8	228,633	23,396	10.2	38,223	11,607	30.4	43,432	8,305	19.1
1998	271,059	34,476	12.7	227,229	25,370	11.2	39,000	12,907	33.1	42,539	8,478	19.9
1997	268,480	35,574	13.3	225,369	26,217	11.6	38,412	13,494	35.1	41,672	8,687	20.8
1996	266,218	36,529	13.7	223,955	27,376	12.2	38,584	13,796	35.8	40,727	8,452	20.8
1995	263,733	36,425	13.8	222,792	27,501	12.3	38,908	14,205	36.5	39,484	8,247	20.9
1994	261,616	38,059	14.5	221,430	28,985	13.1	37,253	14,380	38.6	38,538	8,287	21.5
1993	259,278	39,265	15.1	219,489	29,927	13.6	37,861	14,636	38.7	38,038	8,388	22.1
1992[r]	256,549	38,014	14.8	217,936	28,961	13.3	36,446	14,205	39.0	36,842	8,075	21.9
1991[r]	251,192	35,708	14.2	212,723	27,143	12.8	34,795	13,824	39.7	36,845	7,773	21.1
1990	248,644	33,585	13.5	210,967	25,232	12.0	33,795	12,578	37.2	36,056	7,446	20.7
1989	245,992	31,528	12.8	209,515	24,066	11.5	32,525	11,668	35.9	35,185	6,760	19.2
1988[r]	243,530	31,745	13.0	208,056	24,048	11.6	32,164	11,972	37.2	34,340	7,070	20.6
1987[r]	240,982	32,221	13.4	206,877	24,725	12.0	31,893	12,148	38.1	32,992	6,857	20.8
1986	238,554	32,370	13.6	205,459	24,754	12.0	31,152	11,944	38.3	31,679	6,846	21.6
1985	236,594	33,064	14.0	203,963	25,729	12.6	30,878	11,600	37.6	31,351	6,725	21.5
1984	233,816	33,700	14.4	202,288	26,458	13.1	30,844	11,831	38.4	30,268	6,609	21.8
1983	231,700	35,303	15.2	201,338	27,933	13.9	30,049	12,072	40.2	29,158	6,740	23.1
1982	229,412	34,398	15.0	200,385	27,349	13.6	28,834	11,701	40.6	27,908	6,458	23.1
1981	227,157	31,822	14.0	198,541	24,850	12.5	28,587	11,051	38.7	27,714	6,490	23.4
1980	225,027	29,272	13.0	196,963	22,601	11.5	27,565	10,120	36.7	27,133	6,227	22.9
1979	222,903	26,072	11.7	195,860	19,964	10.2	26,927	9,400	34.9	26,170	5,743	21.9
1978	215,656	24,497	11.4	191,071	19,062	10.0	26,032	9,269	35.6	24,585	5,435	22.1
1977	213,867	24,720	11.6	190,757	19,505	10.2	25,404	9,205	36.2	23,110	5,216	22.6
1976	212,303	24,975	11.8	190,844	19,632	10.3	24,204	9,029	37.3	21,459	5,344	24.9
1975	210,864	25,877	12.3	190,630	20,789	10.9	23,580	8,846	37.5	20,234	5,088	25.1
1974	209,362	23,370	11.2	190,436	18,817	9.9	23,165	8,462	36.5	18,926	4,553	24.1
1973	207,621	22,973	11.1	189,361	18,299	9.7	21,823	8,178	37.5	18,260	4,674	25.6
1972	206,004	24,460	11.9	189,193	19,577	10.3	21,264	8,114	38.2	16,811	4,883	29.0
1971	204,554	25,559	12.5	188,242	20,405	10.8	20,153	7,797	38.7	16,311	5,154	31.6
1970	202,183	25,420	12.6	186,692	20,330	10.9	19,673	7,503	38.1	15,491	5,090	32.9
1969	199,517	24,147	12.1	184,891	19,175	10.4	17,995	6,879	38.2	14,626	4,972	34.0
1968	197,628	25,389	12.8	183,825	20,695	11.3	18,046	6,990	38.7	13,803	4,694	34.0
1967	195,672	27,769	14.2	182,558	22,771	12.5	17,788	6,898	38.8	13,114	4,998	38.1
1966	193,388	28,510	14.7	181,117	23,809	13.1	17,240	6,861	39.8	12,271	4,701	38.3
1965	191,413	33,185	17.3	179,281	28,358	15.8	16,371	7,524	46.0	12,132	4,827	39.8
1964	189,710	36,055	19.0	177,653	30,912	17.4	(NA)	7,297	44.4	12,057	5,143	42.7
1963	187,258	36,436	19.5	176,076	31,498	17.9	(NA)	7,646	47.7	11,182	4,938	44.2
1962	184,276	38,625	21.0	173,263	33,623	19.4	(NA)	7,781	50.3	11,013	5,002	45.4
1961	181,277	39,628	21.9	170,131	34,509	20.3	(NA)	7,252	48.1	11,146	5,119	45.9
1960	179,503	39,851	22.2	168,615	34,925	20.7	(NA)	7,247	48.9	10,888	4,926	45.2
1959	176,557	39,490	22.4	165,858	34,562	20.8	(NA)	7,014	49.4	10,699	4,928	46.1

See footnotes at end of table.

Table A-1.
Poverty Status of People by Family Relationship, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1959 to 2000—Con.

[Numbers in thousands. People as of March of the following year]

Year and characteristic	All people			People in families						Unrelated individuals		
		Below poverty level		All families			Families with female householder, no husband present				Below poverty level	
					Below poverty level			Below poverty level				
	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent
WHITE												
2000	225,993	21,291	9.4	187,670	14,430	7.7	23,606	5,210	22.1	37,217	6,404	17.2
1999	224,373	21,922	9.8	187,139	15,141	8.1	23,895	5,891	24.7	36,151	6,375	17.6
1998	222,837	23,454	10.5	186,184	16,549	8.9	24,211	6,674	27.6	35,563	6,386	18.0
1997	221,200	24,396	11.0	185,147	17,258	9.3	23,773	7,296	30.7	34,858	6,593	18.9
1996	219,656	24,650	11.2	184,110	17,621	9.6	23,744	7,073	29.8	34,247	6,463	18.9
1995	218,028	24,423	11.2	183,450	17,593	9.6	23,732	7,047	29.7	33,399	6,336	19.0
1994	216,460	25,379	11.7	182,546	18,474	10.1	22,713	7,228	31.8	32,569	6,292	19.3
1993	214,899	26,226	12.2	181,330	18,968	10.5	23,224	7,199	31.0	32,112	6,443	20.1
1992[1]	213,060	25,259	11.9	180,409	18,294	10.1	22,453	6,907	30.8	31,170	6,147	19.7
1991[1]	210,133	23,747	11.3	177,619	17,268	9.7	21,608	6,806	31.5	31,207	5,872	18.8
1990	208,611	22,326	10.7	176,504	15,916	9.0	20,845	6,210	29.8	30,833	5,739	18.6
1989	206,853	20,785	10.0	175,857	15,179	8.6	20,362	5,723	28.1	29,993	5,063	16.9
1988[1]	205,235	20,715	10.1	175,111	15,001	8.6	20,396	5,950	29.2	29,315	5,314	18.1
1987[1]	203,605	21,195	10.4	174,488	15,593	8.9	20,244	5,989	29.6	28,290	5,174	18.3
1986	202,282	22,183	11.0	174,024	16,393	9.4	20,163	6,171	30.6	27,143	5,198	19.2
1985	200,918	22,860	11.4	172,863	17,125	9.9	20,105	5,990	29.8	27,067	5,299	19.6
1984	198,941	22,955	11.5	171,839	17,299	10.1	19,727	5,866	29.7	26,094	5,181	19.9
1983	197,496	23,984	12.1	171,407	18,377	10.7	19,256	6,017	31.2	25,206	5,189	20.6
1982	195,919	23,517	12.0	170,748	18,015	10.6	18,374	5,686	30.9	24,300	5,041	20.7
1981	194,504	21,553	11.1	169,868	16,127	9.5	18,795	5,600	29.8	23,913	5,061	21.2
1980	192,912	19,699	10.2	168,756	14,587	8.6	17,642	4,940	28.0	23,370	4,760	20.4
1979	191,742	17,214	9.0	168,461	12,495	7.4	17,349	4,375	25.2	22,587	4,452	19.7
1978	186,450	16,259	8.7	165,193	12,050	7.3	16,877	4,371	25.9	21,257	4,209	19.8
1977	185,254	16,416	8.9	165,385	12,364	7.5	16,721	4,474	26.8	19,869	4,051	20.4
1976	184,165	16,713	9.1	165,571	12,500	7.5	15,941	4,463	28.0	18,594	4,213	22.7
1975	183,164	17,770	9.7	165,661	13,799	8.3	15,577	4,577	29.4	17,503	3,972	22.7
1974	182,376	15,736	8.6	166,081	12,181	7.3	15,433	4,278	27.7	16,295	3,555	21.8
1973	181,185	15,142	8.4	165,424	11,412	6.9	14,303	4,003	28.0	15,761	3,730	23.7
1972	180,125	16,203	9.0	165,630	12,268	7.4	13,739	3,770	27.4	14,495	3,935	27.1
1971	179,398	17,780	9.9	165,184	13,566	8.2	13,502	4,099	30.4	14,214	4,214	29.6
1970	177,376	17,484	9.9	163,875	13,323	8.1	13,226	3,761	28.4	13,500	4,161	30.8
1969	175,349	16,659	9.5	162,779	12,623	7.8	12,285	3,577	29.1	12,570	4,036	32.1
1968	173,732	17,395	10.0	161,777	13,546	8.4	12,190	3,551	29.1	11,955	3,849	32.2
1967	172,038	18,983	11.0	160,720	14,851	9.2	12,131	3,453	28.5	11,318	4,132	36.5
1966	170,247	19,290	11.3	159,561	15,430	9.7	12,261	3,646	29.7	10,686	3,860	36.1
1965	168,732	22,496	13.3	158,255	18,508	11.7	11,573	4,092	35.4	10,477	3,988	38.1
1964	167,313	24,957	14.9	156,898	20,716	13.2	(NA)	3,911	33.4	10,415	4,241	40.7
1963	165,309	25,238	15.3	155,584	21,149	13.6	(NA)	4,051	35.6	9,725	4,089	42.0
1962	162,842	26,672	16.4	153,348	22,613	14.7	(NA)	4,089	37.9	9,494	4,059	42.7
1961	160,306	27,890	17.4	150,717	23,747	15.8	(NA)	4,062	37.6	9,589	4,143	43.2
1960	158,863	28,309	17.8	149,458	24,262	16.2	(NA)	4,296	39.0	9,405	4,047	43.0
1959	156,956	28,484	18.1	147,802	24,443	16.5	(NA)	4,232	40.2	9,154	4,041	44.1

See footnotes at end of table.

Table A-1.
Poverty Status of People by Family Relationship, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1959 to 2000—Con.

[Numbers in thousands. People as of March of the following year]

Year and characteristic	All people			People in families						Unrelated individuals		
		Below poverty level		All families			Families with female householder, no husband present				Below poverty level	
					Below poverty level			Below poverty level				
	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent
WHITE NON-HISPANIC												
2000	193,878	14,572	7.5	159,100	8,783	5.5	16,028	3,250	18.0	33,887	5,447	16.1
1999	193,334	14,875	7.7	159,362	9,118	5.7	16,233	3,618	19.8	33,136	5,440	16.4
1998	192,754	15,799	8.2	159,301	10,061	6.3	16,547	4,074	22.0	32,573	5,352	16.4
1997	191,859	16,491	8.6	158,796	10,401	6.5	16,474	4,604	24.9	32,049	5,632	17.6
1996	191,459	16,462	8.6	159,044	10,553	6.6	16,597	4,339	23.3	31,410	5,455	17.4
1995	190,951	16,267	8.5	159,402	10,599	6.6	16,340	4,183	22.8	30,586	5,303	17.3
1994	192,543	18,110	9.4	161,254	12,118	7.5	16,186	4,743	26.1	30,157	5,500	18.2
1993	190,843	18,882	9.9	160,062	12,756	8.0	16,508	4,724	25.5	29,681	5,570	18.8
1992[r]	189,001	18,202	9.6	159,102	12,277	7.7	16,016	4,640	25.8	28,775	5,350	18.6
1991[r]	189,116	17,741	9.4	158,850	11,998	7.6	17,609	4,710	26.7	29,215	5,261	18.0
1990	188,129	16,622	8.8	158,394	11,086	7.0	17,160	4,284	25.0	28,688	5,002	17.4
1989	186,979	15,599	8.3	158,127	10,723	6.8	16,827	3,922	23.3	28,055	4,466	15.9
1988[r]	185,961	15,565	8.4	157,687	10,467	6.6	16,828	3,988	23.7	27,552	4,746	17.2
1987[r]	184,936	16,029	8.7	157,785	11,051	7.0	16,787	4,075	24.3	26,439	4,613	17.4
1986	184,119	17,244	9.4	157,665	12,078	7.7	16,739	4,350	26.0	25,525	4,668	18.3
1985	183,455	17,839	9.7	157,106	12,706	8.1	16,749	4,136	24.7	25,544	4,789	18.7
1984	182,469	18,300	10.0	156,930	13,234	8.4	16,742	4,193	25.0	24,671	4,659	18.9
1983	181,393	19,538	10.8	156,719	14,437	9.2	16,369	4,448	27.2	23,894	4,746	19.9
1982	181,903	19,362	10.6	157,818	14,271	9.0	15,830	4,161	26.3	23,329	4,701	20.2
1981	180,909	17,987	9.9	157,330	12,903	8.2	16,323	4,222	25.9	22,950	4,769	20.8
1980	179,798	16,365	9.1	156,633	11,568	7.4	15,358	3,699	24.1	22,455	4,474	19.9
1979	178,814	14,419	8.1	156,567	10,009	6.4	15,410	3,371	21.9	21,638	4,179	19.3
1978	174,731	13,755	7.9	154,321	9,798	6.3	15,132	3,390	22.4	20,410	3,957	19.4
1977	173,563	13,802	8.0	154,449	9,977	6.5	14,888	3,429	23.0	19,114	3,825	20.0
1976	173,235	14,025	8.1	155,324	10,066	6.5	14,261	3,516	24.7	17,912	3,959	22.1
1975	172,417	14,883	8.6	155,539	11,137	7.2	13,809	3,570	25.9	16,879	3,746	22.2
1974	171,463	13,217	7.7	155,764	9,854	6.3	13,763	3,379	24.6	15,699	3,364	21.4
1973	170,488	12,864	7.5	155,330	9,262	6.0	12,731	3,185	25.0	15,158	3,602	23.8
BLACK												
2000	35,748	7,901	22.1	29,495	6,147	20.8	12,184	4,720	38.7	6,098	1,708	28.0
1999	35,373	8,360	23.6	29,488	6,688	22.7	12,644	5,179	41.0	5,619	1,552	27.6
1998	34,877	9,091	26.1	29,333	7,259	24.7	13,156	5,629	42.8	5,390	1,752	32.5
1997	34,458	9,116	26.5	28,962	7,386	25.5	13,218	5,654	42.8	5,316	1,645	31.0
1996	34,110	9,694	28.4	28,933	7,993	27.6	13,193	6,123	46.4	4,989	1,606	32.2
1995	33,740	9,872	29.3	28,777	8,189	28.5	13,604	6,553	48.2	4,756	1,551	32.6
1994	33,353	10,196	30.6	28,499	8,447	29.6	12,926	6,489	50.2	4,649	1,617	34.8
1993	32,910	10,877	33.1	28,106	9,242	32.9	13,132	6,955	53.0	4,608	1,541	33.4
1992[r]	32,411	10,827	33.4	27,790	9,134	32.9	12,591	6,799	54.0	4,410	1,569	35.6
1991[r]	31,313	10,242	32.7	26,565	8,504	32.0	11,960	6,557	54.8	4,505	1,590	35.3
1990	30,806	9,837	31.9	26,296	8,160	31.0	11,866	6,005	50.6	4,244	1,491	35.1
1989	30,332	9,302	30.7	25,931	7,704	29.7	11,190	5,530	49.4	4,180	1,471	35.2
1988[r]	29,849	9,356	31.3	25,484	7,650	30.0	10,794	5,601	51.9	4,095	1,509	36.8
1987[r]	29,362	9,520	32.4	25,128	7,848	31.2	10,701	5,789	54.1	3,977	1,471	37.0
1986	28,871	8,983	31.1	24,910	7,410	29.7	10,175	5,473	53.8	3,714	1,431	38.5

See footnotes at end of table.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table A-1.
Poverty Status of People by Family Relationship, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1959 to 2000—Con.

[Numbers in thousands. People as of March of the following year]

Year and characteristic	All people			People in families						Unrelated individuals		
		Below poverty level		All families			Families with female householder, no husband present				Below poverty level	
					Below poverty level			Below poverty level				
	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent
BLACK—Con.												
1985	28,485	8,926	31.3	24,620	7,504	30.5	10,041	5,342	53.2	3,641	1,264	34.7
1984	28,087	9,490	33.8	24,387	8,104	33.2	10,384	5,666	54.6	3,501	1,255	35.8
1983	27,678	9,882	35.7	24,138	8,376	34.7	10,059	5,736	57.0	3,287	1,338	40.7
1982	27,216	9,697	35.6	23,948	8,355	34.9	9,699	5,698	58.8	3,051	1,229	40.3
1981	26,834	9,173	34.2	23,423	7,780	33.2	9,214	5,222	56.7	3,277	1,296	39.6
1980	26,408	8,579	32.5	23,084	7,190	31.1	9,338	4,984	53.4	3,208	1,314	41.0
1979	25,944	8,050	31.0	22,666	6,800	30.0	9,065	4,816	53.1	3,127	1,168	37.3
1978	24,956	7,625	30.6	22,027	6,493	29.5	8,689	4,712	54.2	2,929	1,132	38.6
1977	24,710	7,726	31.3	21,850	6,667	30.5	8,315	4,595	55.3	2,860	1,059	37.0
1976	24,399	7,595	31.1	21,840	6,576	30.1	7,926	4,415	55.7	2,559	1,019	39.8
1975	24,089	7,545	31.3	21,687	6,533	30.1	7,679	4,168	54.3	2,402	1,011	42.1
1974	23,699	7,182	30.3	21,341	6,255	29.3	7,483	4,116	55.0	2,359	927	39.3
1973	23,512	7,388	31.4	21,328	6,560	30.8	7,188	4,064	56.5	2,183	828	37.9
1972	23,144	7,710	33.3	21,116	6,841	32.4	7,125	4,139	58.1	2,028	870	42.9
1971	22,784	7,396	32.5	20,900	6,530	31.2	6,398	3,587	56.1	1,884	866	46.0
1970	22,515	7,548	33.5	20,724	6,683	32.2	6,225	3,656	58.7	1,791	865	48.3
1969	22,011	7,095	32.2	20,192	6,245	30.9	5,537	3,225	58.2	1,819	850	46.7
1968	21,944	7,616	34.7	(NA)	6,839	33.7	(NA)	3,312	58.9	(NA)	777	46.3
1967	21,590	8,486	39.3	(NA)	7,677	38.4	(NA)	3,362	61.6	(NA)	809	49.3
1966	21,206	8,867	41.8	(NA)	8,090	40.9	(NA)	3,160	65.3	(NA)	777	54.4
1959	18,013	9,927	55.1	(NA)	9,112	54.9	(NA)	2,416	70.6	1,430	815	57.0
HISPANIC[1]												
2000	33,719	7,155	21.2	29,981	6,026	20.1	6,032	2,204	36.5	3,520	1,012	28.7
1999	32,669	7,439	22.8	29,198	6,349	21.7	6,113	2,488	40.7	3,207	991	30.9
1998	31,515	8,070	25.6	28,055	6,814	24.3	6,074	2,837	46.7	3,218	1,097	34.1
1997	30,637	8,308	27.1	27,467	7,198	26.2	5,718	2,911	50.9	2,976	1,017	34.2
1996	29,614	8,697	29.4	26,340	7,515	28.5	5,641	3,020	53.5	2,985	1,066	35.7
1995	28,344	8,574	30.3	25,165	7,341	29.2	5,785	3,053	52.8	2,947	1,092	37.0
1994	27,442	8,416	30.7	24,390	7,357	30.2	5,328	2,920	54.8	2,798	926	33.1
1993	26,559	8,126	30.6	23,439	6,876	29.3	5,333	2,837	53.2	2,717	972	35.8
1992[r]	25,646	7,592	29.6	22,695	6,455	28.4	4,806	2,474	51.5	2,577	881	34.2
1991[r]	22,070	6,339	28.7	19,658	5,541	28.2	4,326	2,282	52.7	2,146	667	31.1
1990	21,405	6,006	28.1	18,912	5,091	26.9	3,993	2,115	53.0	2,254	774	34.3
1989	20,746	5,430	26.2	18,488	4,659	25.2	3,763	1,902	50.6	2,045	634	31.0
1988[r]	20,064	5,357	26.7	18,102	4,700	26.0	3,734	2,052	55.0	1,864	597	32.0
1987[r]	19,395	5,422	28.0	17,342	4,761	27.5	3,678	2,045	55.6	1,933	598	31.0
1986	18,758	5,117	27.3	16,880	4,469	26.5	3,631	1,921	52.9	1,685	553	32.8
1985	18,075	5,236	29.0	16,276	4,605	28.3	3,561	1,983	55.7	1,602	532	33.2
1984	16,916	4,806	28.4	15,293	4,192	27.4	3,139	1,764	56.2	1,481	545	36.8
1983	16,544	4,633	28.0	15,075	4,113	27.3	3,032	1,670	55.1	1,364	457	33.5
1982	14,385	4,301	29.9	13,242	3,865	29.2	2,664	1,601	60.1	1,018	358	35.1
1981	14,021	3,713	26.5	12,922	3,349	25.9	2,622	1,465	55.9	1,005	313	31.1
1980	13,600	3,491	25.7	12,547	3,143	25.1	2,421	1,319	54.5	970	312	32.2
1979	13,371	2,921	21.8	12,291	2,599	21.1	2,058	1,053	51.2	991	286	28.8
1978	12,079	2,607	21.6	11,193	2,343	20.9	1,817	1,024	56.4	886	264	29.8
1977	12,046	2,700	22.4	11,249	2,463	21.9	1,901	1,077	56.7	797	237	29.8
1976	11,269	2,783	24.7	10,552	2,516	23.8	1,766	1,000	56.6	716	266	37.2

See footnotes at end of table.

Table A-1.
Poverty Status of People by Family Relationship, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1959 to 2000—Con.

[Numbers in thousands. People as of March of the following year]

Year and characteristic	All people			People in families						Unrelated individuals		
		Below poverty level		All families			Families with female householder, no husband present				Below poverty level	
					Below poverty level			Below poverty level				
	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent
HISPANIC[1]—Con.												
1975	11,117	2,991	26.9	10,472	2,755	26.3	1,842	1,053	57.2	645	236	36.6
1974	11,201	2,575	23.0	10,584	2,374	22.4	1,723	915	53.1	617	201	32.6
1973	10,795	2,366	21.9	10,269	2,209	21.5	1,534	881	57.4	526	157	29.9
1972	10,588	2,414	22.8	10,099	2,252	22.3	1,370	733	53.5	488	162	33.2
ASIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER												
2000	11,357	1,226	10.8	9,948	946	9.5	1,049	204	19.5	1,375	271	19.7
1999	10,916	1,163	10.7	9,618	919	9.6	1,097	253	23.0	1,267	238	18.8
1998	10,873	1,360	12.5	9,576	1,087	11.4	1,123	373	33.2	1,266	257	20.3
1997	10,482	1,468	14.0	9,312	1,116	12.0	932	313	33.6	1,134	327	28.9
1996	10,054	1,454	14.5	8,900	1,172	13.2	1,018	300	29.5	1,120	255	22.8
1995	9,644	1,411	14.6	8,582	1,112	13.0	919	266	28.9	1,013	260	25.6
1994	6,654	974	14.6	5,915	776	13.1	582	137	23.6	696	179	25.7
1993	7,434	1,134	15.3	6,609	898	13.6	725	126	17.4	791	228	28.8
1992'	7,779	985	12.7	6,922	787	11.4	729	183	25.0	828	193	23.3
1991'	7,192	996	13.8	6,367	773	12.1	721	177	24.6	785	209	26.6
1990	7,014	858	12.2	6,300	712	11.3	638	132	20.7	668	124	18.5
1989	6,673	939	14.1	5,917	779	13.2	614	212	34.6	712	144	20.2
1988'	6,447	1,117	17.3	5,767	942	16.3	650	263	40.5	651	160	24.5
1987'	6,322	1,021	16.1	5,785	875	15.1	584	187	32.0	516	138	26.8

'For 1992, figures are based on 1990 census population controls. For 1991, figures are revised to correct for nine omitted weights from the original March 1992 CPS file. For 1988 and 1987, figures are based on new processing procedures and are also revised to reflect corrections to the files after publication of the 1988 advance report, *Money Income and Poverty Status in the United States: 1988*, P-60, No. 166.

NA Not available.

[1]Hispanics may be of any race.

Note: Prior to 1979, people in unrelated subfamilies were included in people in families. Beginning in 1979, people in unrelated subfamilies are included in all people but are excluded from people in families.

Table A-2.
Poverty Status of People by Age, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1959 to 2000

[Numbers in thousands. People as of March of the following year]

Year and characteristic	Under 18 years						18 to 64 years			65 years and over		
	All people			Related children in families				Below poverty level			Below poverty level	
	Total	Below poverty level		Total	Below poverty level		Total			Total		
		Number	Percent		Number	Percent		Number	Percent		Number	Percent
ALL RACES												
2000	71,932	11,633	16.2	70,769	11,086	15.7	171,006	16,146	9.4	32,979	3,360	10.2
1999	71,731	12,109	16.9	70,480	11,510	16.3	169,141	16,982	10.0	32,621	3,167	9.7
1998	71,338	13,467	18.9	70,253	12,845	18.3	167,326	17,623	10.5	32,394	3,386	10.5
1997	71,069	14,113	19.9	69,844	13,422	19.2	165,329	18,084	10.9	32,082	3,376	10.5
1996	70,650	14,463	20.5	69,411	13,764	19.8	163,691	18,638	11.4	31,877	3,428	10.8
1995	70,566	14,665	20.8	69,425	13,999	20.2	161,508	18,442	11.4	31,658	3,318	10.5
1994	70,020	15,289	21.8	68,819	14,610	21.2	160,329	19,107	11.9	31,267	3,663	11.7
1993	69,292	15,727	22.7	68,040	14,961	22.0	159,208	19,781	12.4	30,779	3,755	12.2
1992[r]	68,440	15,294	22.3	67,256	14,521	21.6	157,680	18,793	11.9	30,430	3,928	12.9
1991[r]	65,918	14,341	21.8	64,800	13,658	21.1	154,684	17,586	11.4	30,590	3,781	12.4
1990	65,049	13,431	20.6	63,908	12,715	19.9	153,502	16,496	10.7	30,093	3,658	12.2
1989	64,144	12,590	19.6	63,225	12,001	19.0	152,282	15,575	10.2	29,566	3,363	11.4
1988[r]	63,747	12,455	19.5	62,906	11,935	19.0	150,761	15,809	10.5	29,022	3,481	12.0
1987[r]	63,294	12,843	20.3	62,423	12,275	19.7	149,201	15,815	10.6	28,487	3,563	12.5
1986	62,948	12,876	20.5	62,009	12,257	19.8	147,631	16,017	10.8	27,975	3,477	12.4
1985	62,876	13,010	20.7	62,019	12,483	20.1	146,396	16,598	11.3	27,322	3,456	12.6
1984	62,447	13,420	21.5	61,681	12,929	21.0	144,551	16,952	11.7	26,818	3,330	12.4
1983	62,334	13,911	22.3	61,578	13,427	21.8	143,052	17,767	12.4	26,313	3,625	13.8
1982	62,345	13,647	21.9	61,565	13,139	21.3	141,328	17,000	12.0	25,738	3,751	14.6
1981	62,449	12,505	20.0	61,756	12,068	19.5	139,477	15,464	11.1	25,231	3,853	15.3
1980	62,914	11,543	18.3	62,168	11,114	17.9	137,428	13,858	10.1	24,686	3,871	15.7
1979	63,375	10,377	16.4	62,646	9,993	16.0	135,333	12,014	8.9	24,194	3,682	15.2
1978	62,311	9,931	15.9	61,987	9,722	15.7	130,169	11,332	8.7	23,175	3,233	14.0
1977	63,137	10,288	16.2	62,823	10,028	16.0	128,262	11,316	8.8	22,468	3,177	14.1
1976	64,028	10,273	16.0	63,729	10,081	15.8	126,175	11,389	9.0	22,100	3,313	15.0
1975	65,079	11,104	17.1	64,750	10,882	16.8	124,122	11,456	9.2	21,662	3,317	15.3
1974	66,134	10,156	15.4	65,802	9,967	15.1	122,101	10,132	8.3	21,127	3,085	14.6
1973	66,959	9,642	14.4	66,626	9,453	14.2	120,060	9,977	8.3	20,602	3,354	16.3
1972	67,930	10,284	15.1	67,592	10,082	14.9	117,957	10,438	8.8	20,117	3,738	18.6
1971	68,816	10,551	15.3	68,474	10,344	15.1	115,911	10,735	9.3	19,827	4,273	21.6
1970	69,159	10,440	15.1	68,815	10,235	14.9	113,554	10,187	9.0	19,470	4,793	24.6
1969	69,090	9,691	14.0	68,746	9,501	13.8	111,528	9,669	8.7	18,899	4,787	25.3
1968	70,385	10,954	15.6	70,035	10,739	15.3	108,684	9,803	9.0	18,559	4,632	25.0
1967	70,408	11,656	16.6	70,058	11,427	16.3	107,024	10,725	10.0	18,240	5,388	29.5
1966	70,218	12,389	17.6	69,869	12,146	17.4	105,241	11,007	10.5	17,929	5,114	28.5
1965	69,986	14,676	21.0	69,638	14,388	20.7	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
1964	69,711	16,051	23.0	69,364	15,736	22.7	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
1963	69,181	16,005	23.1	68,837	15,691	22.8	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
1962	67,722	16,963	25.0	67,385	16,630	24.7	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
1961	66,121	16,909	25.6	65,792	16,577	25.2	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
1960	65,601	17,634	26.9	65,275	17,288	26.5	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
1959	64,315	17,552	27.3	63,995	17,208	26.9	96,685	16,457	17.0	15,557	5,481	35.2
WHITE												
2000	56,408	7,328	13.0	55,463	6,873	12.4	140,462	11,361	8.1	29,123	2,602	8.9
1999	56,232	7,568	13.5	55,274	7,123	12.9	139,261	11,945	8.6	28,880	2,409	8.3
1998	56,016	8,443	15.1	55,126	7,935	14.4	138,061	12,456	9.0	28,759	2,555	8.9
1997	55,863	8,990	16.1	54,870	8,441	15.4	136,783	12,838	9.4	28,553	2,569	9.0
1996	55,606	9,044	16.3	54,599	8,488	15.5	135,586	12,940	9.5	28,464	2,667	9.4

See footnotes at end of table.

Table A-2.
Poverty Status of People by Age, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1959 to 2000—Con.

[Numbers in thousands. People as of March of the following year]

Year and characteristic	Under 18 years						18 to 64 years			65 years and over		
	All people			Related children in families				Below poverty level			Below poverty level	
	Total	Below poverty level		Total	Below poverty level		Total			Total		
		Number	Percent		Number	Percent		Number	Percent		Number	Percent
WHITE—Con.												
1995	55,444	8,981	16.2	54,532	8,474	15.5	134,149	12,869	9.6	28,436	2,572	9.0
1994	55,186	9,346	16.9	54,221	8,826	16.3	133,289	13,187	9.9	27,985	2,846	10.2
1993	54,639	9,752	17.8	53,614	9,123	17.0	132,680	13,535	10.2	27,580	2,939	10.7
1992[r]	54,110	9,399	17.4	53,110	8,752	16.5	131,694	12,871	9.8	27,256	2,989	11.0
1991[r]	52,523	8,848	16.8	51,627	8,316	16.1	130,312	12,097	9.3	27,297	2,802	10.3
1990	51,929	8,232	15.9	51,028	7,696	15.1	129,784	11,387	8.8	26,898	2,707	10.1
1989	51,400	7,599	14.8	50,704	7,164	14.1	128,974	10,647	8.3	26,479	2,539	9.6
1988[r]	51,203	7,435	14.5	50,590	7,095	14.0	128,031	10,687	8.3	26,001	2,593	10.0
1987[r]	51,012	7,788	15.3	50,360	7,398	14.7	126,991	10,703	8.4	25,602	2,704	10.6
1986	51,111	8,209	16.1	50,356	7,714	15.3	125,998	11,285	9.0	25,173	2,689	10.7
1985	51,031	8,253	16.2	50,358	7,838	15.6	125,258	11,909	9.5	24,629	2,698	11.0
1984	50,814	8,472	16.7	50,192	8,086	16.1	123,922	11,904	9.6	24,206	2,579	10.7
1983	50,726	8,862	17.5	50,183	8,534	17.0	123,014	12,347	10.0	23,754	2,776	11.7
1982	50,920	8,678	17.0	50,305	8,282	16.5	121,766	11,971	9.8	23,234	2,870	12.4
1981	51,140	7,785	15.2	50,553	7,429	14.7	120,574	10,790	8.9	22,791	2,978	13.1
1980	51,653	7,181	13.9	51,002	6,817	13.4	118,935	9,478	8.0	22,325	3,042	13.6
1979	52,262	6,193	11.8	51,687	5,909	11.4	117,583	8,110	6.9	21,898	2,911	13.3
1978	51,669	5,831	11.3	51,409	5,674	11.0	113,832	7,897	6.9	20,950	2,530	12.1
1977	52,563	6,097	11.6	52,299	5,943	11.4	112,374	7,893	7.0	20,316	2,426	11.9
1976	53,428	6,189	11.6	53,167	6,034	11.3	110,717	7,890	7.1	20,020	2,633	13.2
1975	54,405	6,927	12.7	54,126	6,748	12.5	109,105	8,210	7.5	19,654	2,634	13.4
1974	55,590	6,223	11.2	55,320	6,079	11.0	107,579	7,053	6.6	19,206	2,460	12.8
1973	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	56,211	5,462	9.7	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	2,698	14.4
1972	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	57,181	5,784	10.1	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	3,072	16.8
1971	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	58,119	6,341	10.9	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	3,605	19.9
1970	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	58,472	6,138	10.5	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	4,011	22.6
1969	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	58,578	5,667	9.7	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	4,052	23.3
1968	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	6,373	10.7	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	17,062	3,939	23.1
1967	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	6,729	11.3	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	16,791	4,646	27.7
1966	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	7,204	12.1	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	16,514	4,357	26.4
1965	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	8,595	14.4	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
1960	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	11,229	20.0	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
1959	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	11,386	20.6	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	4,744	33.1
WHITE NON-HISPANIC												
2000	45,117	4,222	9.4	44,411	3,914	8.8	121,452	8,085	6.7	27,309	2,265	8.3
1999	45,243	4,252	9.4	44,527	3,921	8.8	120,905	8,559	7.1	27,187	2,063	7.6
1998	45,355	4,822	10.6	44,670	4,458	10.0	120,283	8,761	7.3	27,118	2,217	8.2
1997	45,491	5,204	11.4	44,665	4,759	10.7	119,373	9,088	7.6	26,995	2,200	8.1
1996	45,605	5,072	11.1	44,844	4,656	10.4	118,822	9,074	7.6	27,033	2,316	8.6
1995	45,689	5,115	11.2	44,973	4,745	10.6	118,228	8,908	7.5	27,034	2,243	8.3
1994	46,668	5,823	12.5	45,874	5,404	11.8	119,192	9,732	8.2	26,684	2,556	9.6
1993	46,096	6,255	13.6	45,322	5,819	12.8	118,475	9,964	8.4	26,272	2,663	10.1
1992[r]	45,590	6,017	13.2	44,833	5,558	12.4	117,386	9,461	8.1	26,025	2,724	10.5
1991[r]	45,236	5,918	13.1	44,506	5,497	12.4	117,672	9,244	7.9	26,208	2,580	9.8
1990	44,797	5,532	12.3	44,045	5,106	11.6	117,477	8,619	7.3	25,854	2,471	9.6
1989	44,492	5,110	11.5	43,938	4,779	10.9	116,983	8,154	7.0	25,504	2,335	9.2
1988[r]	44,438	4,888	11.0	43,910	4,594	10.5	116,479	8,293	7.1	25,044	2,384	9.5
1987[r]	44,461	5,230	11.8	43,907	4,902	11.2	115,721	8,327	7.2	24,754	2,472	10.0
1986	44,664	5,789	13.0	44,041	5,388	12.2	115,157	8,963	7.8	24,298	2,492	10.3

See footnotes at end of table.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table A-2.
Poverty Status of People by Age, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1959 to 2000—Con.

[Numbers in thousands. People as of March of the following year]

Year and characteristic	Under 18 years						18 to 64 years			65 years and over		
	All people			Related children in families				Below poverty level			Below poverty level	
	Total	Below poverty level		Total	Below poverty level		Total			Total		
		Number	Percent		Number	Percent		Number	Percent		Number	Percent
WHITE NON-HISPANIC—Con.												
1985	44,752	5,745	12.8	44,199	5,421	12.3	114,969	9,608	8.4	23,734	2,486	10.5
1984	44,886	6,156	13.7	44,349	5,828	13.1	114,180	9,734	8.5	23,402	2,410	10.3
1983	44,830	6,649	14.8	44,374	6,381	14.4	113,570	10,279	9.1	22,992	2,610	11.4
1982	45,531	6,566	14.4	45,001	6,229	13.8	113,717	10,082	8.9	22,655	2,714	12.0
1981	45,950	5,946	12.9	45,440	5,639	12.4	112,722	9,207	8.2	22,237	2,834	12.7
1980	46,578	5,510	11.8	45,989	5,174	11.3	111,460	7,990	7.2	21,760	2,865	13.2
1979	46,967	4,730	10.1	46,448	4,476	9.6	110,509	6,930	6.3	21,339	2,759	12.9
1978	46,819	4,506	9.6	46,606	4,383	9.4	107,481	6,837	6.4	20,431	2,412	11.8
1977	47,689	4,714	9.9	47,459	4,582	9.7	106,063	6,772	6.4	19,812	2,316	11.7
1976	48,824	4,799	9.8	48,601	4,664	9.6	104,846	6,720	6.4	19,565	2,506	12.8
1975	49,670	5,342	10.8	49,421	5,185	10.5	103,496	7,039	6.8	19,251	2,503	13.0
1974	50,759	4,820	9.5	50,520	4,697	9.3	101,894	6,051	5.9	18,810	2,346	12.5
BLACK												
2000	11,406	3,526	30.9	11,241	3,454	30.7	21,553	3,752	17.4	2,789	623	22.3
1999	11,357	3,759	33.1	11,132	3,644	32.7	21,261	3,975	18.7	2,754	626	22.7
1998	11,317	4,151	36.7	11,176	4,073	36.4	20,836	4,223	20.3	2,723	718	26.4
1997	11,367	4,225	37.2	11,193	4,116	36.8	20,399	4,191	20.5	2,691	700	26.0
1996	11,338	4,519	39.9	11,155	4,411	39.5	20,155	4,515	22.4	2,616	661	25.3
1995	11,369	4,761	41.9	11,198	4,644	41.5	19,892	4,483	22.5	2,478	629	25.4
1994	11,211	4,906	43.8	11,044	4,787	43.3	19,585	4,590	23.4	2,557	700	27.4
1993	11,127	5,125	46.1	10,969	5,030	45.9	19,272	5,049	26.2	2,510	702	28.0
1992[r]	10,956	5,106	46.6	10,823	5,015	46.3	18,952	4,884	25.8	2,504	838	33.5
1991[r]	10,350	4,755	45.9	10,178	4,637	45.6	18,356	4,607	25.1	2,606	880	33.8
1990	10,162	4,550	44.8	9,980	4,412	44.2	18,097	4,427	24.5	2,547	860	33.8
1989	10,012	4,375	43.7	9,847	4,257	43.2	17,833	4,164	23.3	2,487	763	30.7
1988[r]	9,865	4,296	43.5	9,681	4,148	42.8	17,548	4,275	24.4	2,436	785	32.2
1987[r]	9,730	4,385	45.1	9,546	4,234	44.4	17,245	4,361	25.3	2,387	774	32.4
1986	9,629	4,148	43.1	9,467	4,037	42.7	16,911	4,113	24.3	2,331	722	31.0
1985	9,545	4,157	43.6	9,405	4,057	43.1	16,667	4,052	24.3	2,273	717	31.5
1984	9,480	4,413	46.6	9,356	4,320	46.2	16,369	4,368	26.7	2,238	710	31.7
1983	9,417	4,398	46.7	9,245	4,273	46.2	16,065	4,694	29.2	2,197	791	36.0
1982	9,400	4,472	47.6	9,269	4,388	47.3	15,692	4,415	28.1	2,124	811	38.2
1981	9,374	4,237	45.2	9,291	4,170	44.9	15,358	4,117	26.8	2,102	820	39.0
1980	9,368	3,961	42.3	9,287	3,906	42.1	14,987	3,835	25.6	2,054	783	38.1
1979	9,307	3,833	41.2	9,172	3,745	40.8	14,596	3,478	23.8	2,040	740	36.2
1978	9,229	3,830	41.5	9,168	3,781	41.2	13,774	3,133	22.7	1,954	662	33.9
1977	9,296	3,888	41.8	9,253	3,850	41.6	13,483	3,137	23.3	1,930	701	36.3
1976	9,322	3,787	40.6	9,291	3,758	40.4	13,224	3,163	23.9	1,852	644	34.8
1975	9,421	3,925	41.7	9,374	3,884	41.4	12,872	2,968	23.1	1,795	652	36.3
1974	9,439	3,755	39.8	9,384	3,713	39.6	12,539	2,836	22.6	1,721	591	34.3
1973	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	9,405	3,822	40.6	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	1,672	620	37.1
1972	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	9,426	4,025	42.7	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	1,603	640	39.9
1971	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	9,414	3,836	40.4	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	1,584	623	39.3
1970	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	9,448	3,922	41.5	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	1,422	683	48.0
1969	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	9,290	3,677	39.6	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	1,373	689	50.2
1968	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	4,188	43.1	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	1,374	655	47.7
1967	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	4,558	47.4	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	1,341	715	53.3
1966	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	4,774	50.6	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	1,311	722	55.1
1959	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	5,022	65.6	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	711	62.5

See footnotes at end of table.

Table A-2.
Poverty Status of People by Age, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1959 to 2000—Con.

[Numbers in thousands. People as of March of the following year]

Year and characteristic	Under 18 years						18 to 64 years			65 years and over		
	All people			Related children in families				Below poverty level			Below poverty level	
	Total	Below poverty level		Total	Below poverty level		Total			Total		
		Number	Percent		Number	Percent		Number	Percent		Number	Percent
HISPANIC[1]												
2000	11,886	3,330	28.0	11,632	3,173	27.3	19,951	3,473	17.4	1,882	353	18.8
1999	11,560	3,506	30.3	11,300	3,382	29.9	19,356	3,575	18.5	1,752	358	20.4
1998	11,152	3,837	34.4	10,921	3,670	33.6	18,668	3,877	20.8	1,696	356	21.0
1997	10,802	3,972	36.8	10,625	3,865	36.4	18,218	3,951	21.7	1,617	384	23.8
1996	10,511	4,237	40.3	10,255	4,090	39.9	17,587	4,089	23.3	1,516	370	24.4
1995	10,213	4,080	40.0	10,011	3,938	39.3	16,673	4,153	24.9	1,458	342	23.5
1994	9,822	4,075	41.5	9,621	3,956	41.1	16,192	4,018	24.8	1,428	323	22.6
1993	9,462	3,873	40.9	9,188	3,666	39.9	15,708	3,956	25.2	1,390	297	21.4
1992[2]	9,081	3,637	40.0	8,829	3,440	39.0	15,268	3,668	24.0	1,298	287	22.1
1991[1]	7,648	3,094	40.4	7,473	2,977	39.8	13,279	3,008	22.7	1,143	237	20.8
1990	7,457	2,865	38.4	7,300	2,750	37.7	12,857	2,896	22.5	1,091	245	22.5
1989	7,186	2,603	36.2	7,040	2,496	35.5	12,536	2,616	20.9	1,024	211	20.6
1988[2]	7,003	2,631	37.6	6,908	2,576	37.3	12,056	2,501	20.7	1,005	225	22.4
1987[2]	6,792	2,670	39.3	6,692	2,606	38.9	11,718	2,509	21.4	885	243	27.5
1986	6,646	2,507	37.7	6,511	2,413	37.1	11,206	2,406	21.5	906	204	22.5
1985	6,475	2,606	40.3	6,346	2,512	39.6	10,685	2,411	22.6	915	219	23.9
1984	6,068	2,376	39.2	5,982	2,317	38.7	10,029	2,254	22.5	819	176	21.5
1983	6,066	2,312	38.1	5,977	2,251	37.7	9,697	2,148	22.5	782	173	22.1
1982	5,527	2,181	39.5	5,436	2,117	38.9	8,262	1,963	23.8	596	159	26.6
1981	5,369	1,925	35.9	5,291	1,874	35.4	8,084	1,642	20.3	568	146	25.7
1980	5,276	1,749	33.2	5,211	1,718	33.0	7,740	1,563	20.2	582	179	30.8
1979	5,483	1,535	28.0	5,426	1,505	27.7	7,314	1,232	16.8	574	154	26.8
1978	5,012	1,384	27.6	4,972	1,354	27.2	6,527	1,098	16.8	539	125	23.2
1977	5,028	1,422	28.3	5,000	1,402	28.0	6,500	1,164	17.9	518	113	21.9
1976	4,771	1,443	30.2	4,736	1,424	30.1	6,034	1,212	20.1	464	128	27.7
1975	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	4,896	1,619	33.1	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	137	32.6
1974	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	4,939	1,414	28.6	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	117	28.9
1973	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	4,910	1,364	27.8	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)	95	24.9
ASIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER												
2000	3,154	459	14.5	3,125	447	14.3	7,370	682	9.2	832	86	10.3
1999	3,057	361	11.8	3,026	348	11.5	7,059	717	10.2	800	85	10.6
1998	3,137	564	18.0	3,099	542	17.5	6,951	698	10.0	785	97	12.4
1997	3,096	628	20.3	3,061	608	19.9	6,680	752	11.3	705	87	12.3
1996	2,924	571	19.5	2,899	553	19.1	6,484	821	12.7	647	63	9.7
1995	2,900	564	19.5	2,858	532	18.6	6,123	757	12.4	622	89	14.3
1994	1,739	318	18.3	1,719	308	17.9	4,401	589	13.4	513	67	13.0
1993	2,061	375	18.2	2,029	358	17.6	4,871	680	14.0	503	79	15.6
1992[2]	2,218	363	16.4	2,199	352	16.0	5,067	568	11.2	494	53	10.8
1991[1]	2,056	360	17.5	2,036	348	17.1	4,582	565	12.3	555	70	12.7
1990	2,126	374	17.6	2,098	356	17.0	4,375	422	9.6	514	62	12.1
1989	1,983	392	19.8	1,945	368	18.9	4,225	512	12.1	465	34	7.4
1988[2]	1,970	474	24.1	1,949	458	23.5	4,035	583	14.4	442	60	13.5
1987[2]	1,937	455	23.5	1,908	432	22.7	4,010	510	12.7	375	56	15.0

[1]For 1992, figures are based on 1990 census population controls. For 1991, figures are revised to correct for nine omitted weights from the original March 1992 CPS file. For 1988 and 1987, figures are based on new processing procedures and are also revised to reflect corrections to the files after publication of the 1988 advance report, *Money Income and Poverty Status in the United States: 1988*, P-60, No. 166.

NA Not available.

[1]Hispanics may be of any race.

Note: Prior to 1979, people in unrelated subfamilies were included in people in families. Beginning in 1979, people in unrelated subfamilies are included in all people but are excluded from people in families.

Table A-3.
Poverty Status of Families by Type of Family: 1959 to 2000

[Numbers in thousands. Families as of March of the following year]

Year and characteristic	All families			Married-couple families			Male householder, no wife present			Female householder, no husband present		
		Below poverty level			Below poverty level			Below poverty level			Below poverty level	
	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent
ALL RACES												
2000	72,383	6,226	8.6	55,606	2,638	4.7	4,252	489	11.5	12,526	3,099	24.7
1999	72,031	6,676	9.3	55,315	2,673	4.8	4,028	472	11.7	12,687	3,531	27.8
1998	71,551	7,186	10.0	54,778	2,879	5.3	3,977	476	12.0	12,796	3,831	29.9
1997	70,884	7,324	10.3	54,321	2,821	5.2	3,911	508	13.0	12,652	3,995	31.6
1996	70,241	7,708	11.0	53,604	3,010	5.6	3,847	531	13.8	12,790	4,167	32.6
1995	69,597	7,532	10.8	53,570	2,982	5.6	3,513	493	14.0	12,514	4,057	32.4
1994	69,313	8,053	11.6	53,865	3,272	6.1	3,228	549	17.0	12,220	4,232	34.6
1993	68,506	8,393	12.3	53,181	3,481	6.5	2,914	488	16.8	12,411	4,424	35.6
1992[1]	68,216	8,144	11.9	53,090	3,385	6.4	3,065	484	15.8	12,061	4,275	35.4
1991[1]	67,175	7,712	11.5	52,457	3,158	6.0	3,025	392	13.0	11,693	4,161	35.6
1990	66,322	7,098	10.7	52,147	2,981	5.7	2,907	349	12.0	11,268	3,768	33.4
1989	66,090	6,784	10.3	52,137	2,931	5.6	2,884	348	12.1	10,890	3,504	32.2
1988[1]	65,837	6,874	10.4	52,100	2,897	5.6	2,847	336	11.8	10,890	3,642	33.4
1987[1]	65,204	7,005	10.7	51,675	3,011	5.8	2,833	340	12.0	10,696	3,654	34.2
1986	64,491	7,023	10.9	51,537	3,123	6.1	2,510	287	11.4	10,445	3,613	34.6
1985	63,558	7,223	11.4	50,933	3,438	6.7	2,414	311	12.9	10,211	3,474	34.0
1984	62,706	7,277	11.6	50,350	3,488	6.9	2,228	292	13.1	10,129	3,498	34.5
1983	62,015	7,647	12.3	50,081	3,815	7.6	2,038	268	13.2	9,896	3,564	36.0
1982	61,393	7,512	12.2	49,908	3,789	7.6	2,016	290	14.4	9,469	3,434	36.3
1981	61,019	6,851	11.2	49,630	3,394	6.8	1,986	205	10.3	9,403	3,252	34.6
1980	60,309	6,217	10.3	49,294	3,032	6.2	1,933	213	11.0	9,082	2,972	32.7
1979	59,550	5,461	9.2	49,112	2,640	5.4	1,733	176	10.2	8,705	2,645	30.4
1978	57,804	5,280	9.1	47,692	2,474	5.2	1,654	152	9.2	8,458	2,654	31.4
1977	57,215	5,311	9.3	47,385	2,524	5.3	1,594	177	11.1	8,236	2,610	31.7
1976	56,710	5,311	9.4	47,497	2,606	5.5	1,500	162	10.8	7,713	2,543	33.0
1975	56,245	5,450	9.7	47,318	2,904	6.1	1,445	116	8.0	7,482	2,430	32.5
1974	55,698	4,922	8.8	47,069	2,474	5.3	1,399	125	8.9	7,230	2,324	32.1
1973	55,053	4,828	8.8	46,812	2,482	5.3	1,438	154	10.7	6,804	2,193	32.2
1972	54,373	5,075	9.3	46,314	(NA)	(NA)	1,452	(NA)	(NA)	6,607	2,158	32.7
1971	53,296	5,303	10.0	45,752	(NA)	(NA)	1,353	(NA)	(NA)	6,191	2,100	33.9
1970	52,227	5,260	10.1	44,739	(NA)	(NA)	1,487	(NA)	(NA)	6,001	1,952	32.5
1969	51,586	5,008	9.7	44,436	(NA)	(NA)	1,559	(NA)	(NA)	5,591	1,827	32.7
1968	50,511	5,047	10.0	43,842	(NA)	(NA)	1,228	(NA)	(NA)	5,441	1,755	32.3
1967	49,835	5,667	11.4	43,292	(NA)	(NA)	1,210	(NA)	(NA)	5,333	1,774	33.3
1966	48,921	5,784	11.8	42,553	(NA)	(NA)	1,197	(NA)	(NA)	5,171	1,721	33.1
1965	48,278	6,721	13.9	42,107	(NA)	(NA)	1,179	(NA)	(NA)	4,992	1,916	38.4
1964	47,836	7,160	15.0	41,648	(NA)	(NA)	1,182	(NA)	(NA)	5,006	1,822	36.4
1963	47,436	7,554	15.9	41,311	(NA)	(NA)	1,243	(NA)	(NA)	4,882	1,972	40.4
1962	46,998	8,077	17.2	40,923	(NA)	(NA)	1,334	(NA)	(NA)	4,741	2,034	42.9
1961	46,341	8,391	18.1	40,405	(NA)	(NA)	1,293	(NA)	(NA)	4,643	1,954	42.1
1960	45,435	8,243	18.1	39,624	(NA)	(NA)	1,202	(NA)	(NA)	4,609	1,955	42.4
1959	45,054	8,320	18.5	39,335	(NA)	(NA)	1,226	(NA)	(NA)	4,493	1,916	42.6

[1]For 1992, figures are based on 1990 census population controls. For 1991, figures are revised to correct for nine omitted weights from the original March 1992 CPS file. For 1988 and 1987, figures are based on new processing procedures and are also revised to reflect corrections to the files after publication of the 1988 advance report, *Money Income and Poverty Status in the United States: 1988*, P-60, No. 166.

NA Not available.

Note: Before 1979, unrelated subfamilies were included in all families. Beginning in 1979, unrelated subfamilies are excluded from all families.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table A-4.
People and Families in Poverty by Selected Characteristics: 1993 and 2000

[Numbers in thousands. For an explanation of confidence intervals (C.I.), see Standard errors and their use at www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/poverty00/pov00src.pdf]

Characteristic	2000 below poverty				1993 below poverty				Change[1] 1993 to 2000			
	Number	90-pct. C.I. (±)	Percent	90-pct. C.I. (±)	Number	90-pct. C.I. (±)	Percent	90-pct. C.I. (±)	Number	90-pct. C.I. (±)	Percent	90-pct. C.I. (±)
PEOPLE												
Total	31,139	880	11.3	0.3	39,260	933	15.1	0.4	*–8,122	1,281	*–3.9	0.5
Family Status												
In families	22,088	755	9.6	0.3	29,927	829	13.6	0.4	*–7,839	1,122	*–4.0	0.5
Householder	6,226	227	8.6	0.3	8,393	263	12.3	0.4	*–2,167	347	*–3.7	0.5
Related children under 18	11,086	451	15.7	0.7	14,961	487	22.0	0.8	*–3,875	663	*–6.3	1.0
Related children under 6	3,931	283	16.9	1.3	6,097	331	25.6	1.5	*–2,166	434	*–8.7	2.0
In unrelated subfamilies	520	59	39.4	5.2	945	77	54.3	5.3	*–425	97	*–14.9	7.4
Reference person	198	36	37.5	7.9	367	48	51.6	8.0	*–168	59	*–14.1	11.2
Children under 18	314	82	41.8	12.3	554	105	57.2	12.7	*–239	133	–15.4	17.7
Unrelated individual	8,530	276	18.9	0.6	8,388	263	22.1	0.7	142	382	*–3.1	1.0
Male	3,458	161	16.0	0.8	3,281	151	18.1	0.9	176	220	*–2.1	1.2
Female	5,073	202	21.6	0.9	5,107	194	25.7	1.1	–34	280	*–4.1	1.4
Race[2] and Hispanic Origin												
White	21,291	742	9.4	0.3	26,226	783	12.2	0.4	*–4,935	1,079	*–2.8	0.5
Non-Hispanic	14,572	622	7.5	0.3	18,882	674	9.9	0.4	*–4,311	918	*–2.4	0.5
Black	7,901	416	22.1	1.2	10,877	443	33.1	1.3	*–2,975	607	*–10.9	1.8
Asian and Pacific Islander	1,226	178	10.8	1.6	1,134	165	15.3	2.2	92	242	*–4.5	2.7
Hispanic[3]	7,155	398	21.2	1.2	8,126	400	30.6	1.5	*–971	564	*–9.4	1.9
Age												
Under 18 years	11,633	461	16.2	0.6	15,727	495	22.7	0.7	*–4,095	676	*–6.5	1.0
18 to 64 years	16,146	648	9.4	0.4	19,783	681	12.4	0.4	*–3,637	941	*–3.0	0.6
18 to 24 years	3,893	192	14.4	0.7	4,854	204	19.1	0.8	*–961	281	*–4.6	1.1
25 to 34 years	3,892	199	10.4	0.5	5,804	230	13.8	0.5	*–1,912	303	*–3.4	0.8
35 to 44 years	3,678	192	8.2	0.4	4,415	202	10.6	0.5	*–737	280	*–2.4	0.6
45 to 54 years	2,441	158	6.4	0.4	2,522	155	8.5	0.5	–81	220	*–2.1	0.7
55 to 59 years	1,175	110	8.8	0.8	1,057	100	9.9	0.9	118	150	–1.0	1.3
60 to 64 years	1,066	105	10.2	1.0	1,129	105	11.3	1.0	–63	148	–1.1	1.5
65 years and over	3,360	179	10.2	0.5	3,755	181	12.2	0.6	*–395	253	*–2.0	0.8
Nativity												
Native	26,442	816	10.7	0.3	34,086	875	14.4	0.4	*–7,644	1,198	*–3.7	0.5
Foreign born	4,697	411	15.7	1.4	5,179	413	23.0	1.8	–482	582	*–7.3	2.3
Naturalized citizen	1,107	201	9.7	1.8	707	155	10.1	2.2	*400	253	–0.4	2.8
Not a citizen	3,590	360	19.4	1.9	4,472	385	28.7	2.5	*–882	526	*–9.3	3.1
Region												
Northeast	5,433	357	10.3	0.7	6,839	383	13.3	0.8	*–1,405	523	*–3.0	1.0
Midwest	5,971	411	9.5	0.7	8,172	459	13.4	0.8	*–2,201	617	*–3.9	1.0
South	12,205	595	12.5	0.6	15,375	637	17.1	0.7	*–3,170	870	*–4.6	0.9
West	7,530	474	11.9	0.8	8,879	492	15.6	0.9	*–1,349	683	*–3.7	1.2
Residence												
Inside metropolitan areas	24,296	788	10.8	0.4	29,615	826	14.6	0.4	*–5,319	1,142	*–3.8	0.5
Inside central cities	12,967	589	16.1	0.7	16,805	638	21.5	0.8	*–3,838	869	*–5.3	1.1
Outside central cities	11,329	553	7.8	0.4	12,810	561	10.3	0.5	*–1,481	788	*–2.4	0.6
Outside metropolitan areas	6,843	530	13.4	1.1	9,650	600	17.2	1.1	*–2,807	801	*–3.8	1.5
FAMILIES												
Total	6,226	227	8.6	0.3	8,393	263	12.3	0.4	*–2,167	347	*–3.7	0.5
White	4,153	179	6.9	0.3	5,452	202	9.4	0.4	*–1,299	270	*–2.5	0.5
Non-Hispanic	2,820	145	5.3	0.3	3,988	168	7.6	0.3	*–1,168	222	*–2.3	0.4
Black	1,686	109	19.1	1.3	2,499	130	31.3	1.7	*–813	169	*–12.1	2.2
Asian and Pacific Islander	235	39	8.8	1.5	235	378	13.5	2.3	–	54	*–4.7	2.7
Hispanic[3]	1,431	100	18.5	1.4	1,625	102	27.3	1.8	*–194	143	*–8.8	2.3
Type of Family												
Married-couple	2,638	140	4.7	0.3	3,481	156	6.5	0.3	*–843	209	*–1.8	0.4
White	2,163	125	4.4	0.3	2,757	137	5.8	0.3	*–595	186	*–1.4	0.4
Non-Hispanic	1,447	100	3.3	0.2	2,042	117	4.7	0.3	*–595	153	*–1.4	0.4
Black	260	41	6.1	1.0	458	53	12.3	1.5	*–199	67	*–6.3	1.8
Asian and Pacific Islander	169	33	7.7	1.6	177	33	12.4	2.4	–8	47	*–4.8	2.9
Hispanic[3]	742	71	14.1	1.4	770	69	19.1	1.8	–28	99	*–4.9	2.3
Female householder, no husband present	3,099	151	24.7	1.3	4,424	179	35.6	1.6	*–1,325	235	*–10.9	2.1
White	1,656	109	20.0	1.4	2,376	127	29.2	1.7	*–720	166	*–9.2	2.2
Non-Hispanic	1,127	89	16.9	1.4	1,699	105	25.0	1.7	*–571	137	*–8.1	2.2
Black	1,303	95	34.6	2.8	1,908	112	49.9	3.3	*–605	146	*–15.2	4.4
Asian and Pacific Islander	60	20	19.9	7.1	43	16	18.6	7.4	17	26	1.3	10.3
Hispanic[3]	597	64	34.2	4.0	772	69	51.6	5.4	*–175	94	*–17.4	6.8

– Represents zero. *Statistically significant at the 90-percent confidence level.

[1] As a result of rounding, some differences may appear to be slightly higher or lower than the differences of the reported rates.
[2] Data for American Indians and Alaska Natives are not shown separately.
[3] Hispanics may be of any race.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, March 1994 and 2001.